DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 121 HE 015 364

AUTHOR	Mayhew, Lewis B.
TITLE	Thoughts on the Restoration of Academic Quality. Volume I. Occasional Papers in the Study of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. School of Education.
PUB DATE	Aug 82
NOTE	432p.
AVAILABLE FROM	School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305 ($16.00).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC18 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Centralization; College Instruction; *College Role; Decentralization; *Educational Change; *Educational Quality; Governance; Graduate Study; *Higher Education; School Organization; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Role; Trend Analysis; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

The restoration of academic and intellectual quality in higher education is considered in regard to educational reforms, the undergraduate curriculum, organized out-of-class life, faculty and college teaching, academic leadership, centralized/decentralized organization, accreditation, governance, and graduate education. It is suggested that in three types of institutions academic quality matters are of critical significance: publicly supported two-year community colleges; small privately supported liberal arts colleges; and new privately supported, tuition-supported institutions created since about 1970 to serve new clienteles (i.e., humanistically oriented liberal arts colleges, and law schools designed for part-time students with courses taught by part-time faculty). It is suggested that until about 1970, there appeared to be essential agreement in 20th century colleges and universities as to their central mission and purpose. Beginning in 1970, a substantial wave of anti-intellectualism was embraced by professional educators. In regard to teachers, much of the reforming literature seems to ask that they should also be capable of facilitating development of a wide range of human feeling and emotion. It is proposed that for purposes of maintaining academic quality, as well as institutional survival, a strong centralized administration is needed for some functions, like budgeting and personnel policy formation, while academic quality decisions should be made by subordinate academic administrative units. Supra-institutional coordinating councils, statewide boards, and trustee boards are also discussed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223121

Occasional Papers in the Study of Higher Education

Volume I

Thoughts on the Restoration of Academic Quality

Lewis B. Mayhew

HE 015 364

Stanford University
Committee on Administration and Policy Analysis
School of Education

August 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lewis B.
Mayhew

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ⓒ Copyright 1982
by
Lewis B. Mayhew

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		i
Chapter I	Quality in Education	1
Chapter II	The New Reforming Establishment	39
Chapter III	Undergraduate Curriculum	76
Chapter IV	Organized Out-of-Class Life	129
Chapter V	Faculty -- A Peculiar Breed	158
Chapter VI	College Teaching: A Limited Instrument	183
Chapter VII	Academic Leadership	222
Chapter VIII	Centralized - Decentralized Organization	265
Chapter IX	Accreditation and the Quest for Quality	296
Chapter X	Suprainstitutional Organizations, Boards, and Agencies	325
Chapter XI	Graduate Education	361
Chapter XII	Toward Quality	379
Bibliography		415

QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Preface

This book is intended as a companion work to the book Surviving the Eighties but to stress achieving, maintaining and restoring academic and intellectual quality, whereas the earlier volume stressed sheer survival without explicit concern for qualitative matters. It was, in part, stimulated by a comment made by a reviewer of the earlier volume which praised it, but wished that the author had examined something more than just institutional survival.

The book argues that especially since about 1970 there has been a serious decline in academic and intellectual quality throughout American higher education, although more precipitous in some kinds of institutions than in others. There has beena deterioration of the meaning of academic credit granted toward the award of academic degrees. Prior to the 1970s, except in publicly supported two year community junior colleges, academic credit was typically reserved for academic courses of a specific level of content and complexity, with the exception of those institutions which awarded token credit for courses in physical education. Degree credit was not typically awarded for remedial work, subcollegiate courses, skills courses such as typewriting, field work, work experience, internships or foreign travel. Since 1970, however, virtually any sort of human experience deemed to change human behavior has been judged by at least some institutions as warranting academic credit countable toward an academic degree. At the same time there has been an inflation of academic grades to such an extent that they no longer define different levels of academic performance. Systems using the pass/fail option virtually never award failing grades and the passing grade covers equally, barely not failing, and superior performance. In systems continuing the letter grade option the model undergraduate grade moved from a C to between an A and a B although the academic aptitude of entering students was simultaneously declining. The previous somewhat well-thought-out prescribed general education for students was discarded and the undergraduate curriculum lost rational form and structure except that imposed by individual student interest, desire and choice. At the same time there was a general decline in requirements for preparation in the intellectual skills of English, mathematics and foreign language with the result of a generally noted decline in verbal and quantitative literacy on the part of college graduates. Although the academic qualifications of full-time faculty members in four year bachelor degree granting institutions remained relatively stable, overall the academic preparation of college and university instructors deteriorated seriously through widespread use of part-time faculty marginally prepared or part-time faculty whose preparation was simply some particular kind of work experience. Accompanying this decline in faculty qualification came a decline in the amount of faculty-student contact as institutions embraced considerable use of independent study as financially more affordable than regular sustained faculty-student interaction in classes.

Overall, during the 1970s and 1980s there was a serious dilution of guiding purposes of higher education as institutions sought new activities and markets and expected faculty members to demonstrate new abilities for which they were unprepared. Thus, many institutions moved toward becoming brokers for whatever kind of non-criminal service a particular constituency could be found and expected faculty members to deal with such disparate matters as counseling and advising the aged, instructing the illiterate and unmotivated, and tailoring service to whatever need or condition existed for every individual student.

While this qualitative decline resulted from many forces including institutional financial survival, the decline was in a way orchestrated by the anti-intellectual rhetoric of a group of egalitarian reformers who argued that colleges and universities should meet whatever needs any individuals or groups of individuals had at whatever time and place they arose. These reformers urged such clichés as: universal post secondary education for all and for each, educare comparable to medicare to provide whatever educational service any individual wanted whenever he or she wanted it, a non-traditional pedagogy for non-traditional students, breaking the academic lock-step through awarding credit for whatever seemed to modify behavior, and giving curricular instructional attention to whatever individual talents, traits and abilities seemed to be in need of cultivation.

Throughout the chapters of this book two interrelated themes are developed. The first of these is an examination of the meaning of academic and intellectual quality and judgments as to what might and what might not likely produce it. Academic quality is an abstraction detected through informed judgment, much as aesthetic quality is detected through informed judgment. Essentially though, traditional academic quality involves the mind or intellect. The medieval university emphasized the life of the mind nourished through sustained intellectual interaction between student and faculty, student and student, and faculty and faculty. In a more modern rhetoric it has been argued that the essential mission of the undergraduate institutions is to prepare the young by the use of words, numbers and abstract concepts to understand, cope with, and eventually control the world in which they find themselves. This is not to argue that other human traits and needs are unimportant or that they should not receive institutional attention. Human needs for religion, physical and emotional health, companionship, jobs, or political outlets are all important, but they are not the concern of colleges and universities. To expect collegiate institutions to assume major responsibilities for such things means lesser attention paid to proper educational responsibilities and attempting to provide services for which the collegiate institution is unprepared by tradition, experience and qualifications of individuals within the institutions. Such a conception of quality allows one to judge that some things are and some things are not appropriate for colleges and universities to do in the name of higher education.

The second theme involved public policy as to the proper expenditure of public funds in the name of education. This theme recognizes that there are many worthwhile human needs such as care for the young or aged, advice regarding the many complexities found in the post-industrial society, nurture and support during times of crisis, and individual possession of such things as a sense of justice, honesty, sympathy, empathy and a sense of humor. But does the public have a responsibility to provide funds to meet those needs? The overall point of view in this book is that public responsibility for the support of higher education should be limited to those activities leading to academic degres and leading to direct vocational professional competence of a reasonably sophisticated level, but little else, and the justification for public support is essentially the significant social need for an educated citizenry and well qualified leadership and professional service. The public might rightly be expected to support the training of medical doctors but not to support advocational and recreational programs, no matter how intrinsically valuable they are. Relatedly, it is argued that sound public policy would decrease support for higher education as the demand for its traditional form declined. Rather than supporting higher education to find additional services to provide, it argues that even affluent societies have finite resources and must establish priorities as to how those resources will be used.

And, throughout, the book struggles with a major unresolved issue as it develops a defensible concept of intellectual and academic quality and then seeks to apply it to the publicly supported two-year community junior college. If a tight definition of quality is used much of what these two-year institutions do would have to be judged deficient. Yet in the light of what people seem to want and to be willing to pay for through taxation, these institutions appear to be providing a needed service. They do provide a rather extensive array of technical, vocational training programs which, at least in some fields, lead trained individuals into jobs. They do provide a variety of opportunities for adults to obtain desired avocational, recreational and vocational preparation. With much of the work really not collegiate in quality, Breneman suggested a plausible way out of this dilemma by favoring ". . . an educational division of labor among institutions in the 1980s that would result in the community colleges enrolling fewer full-time academic transfer students of traditional college age and retaining a dominant position in those activities that four year institutions have not undertaken traditionally and are likely to do less well. To a considerable degree, this rough division of labor reflects tendencies and dependencies already underway; four-year residential institutions are working very hard to maintain full-time undergraduate enrollments, while community colleges continue to evolve away from the junior college emphasis on transfer programs toward service to new clienteles. Of course, this division of labor among institutions will never be absolute, nor should it be. For some undergraduates the community college will still be the best option, just as the university will be better for some older students returning to school part-time" (Breneman, 1981). Probably that solution is the only one politically plausible.

However, the power of that solution will always be weakened so long as public subsidy (especially state subsidy) is linked to the award of academic credit. If funds are only provided for the production of academic credit, then institutions will resort to virtually any device to relabel and redescribe whatever kinds of programs are offered in such a way as to carry academic credit. Throughout the book, stress is placed on urging a narrower definition of academic credit which would force institutions to find appealing justifications for their many admittedly desirable activities other than credit toward the achievement of an academic degree.

Overall the book argues for parsimony. It urges an important but limited set of functions for collegiate institutions. Similarly it suggests that faculty members can and should do a limited number of things well, but that faculty members are not omnipotent and should not be expected to be all things to all people. Organizationally the book favors departments, separate schools and single campuses as more effective and desirable with respect to quality than supra institutional organizations and agencies and ad hoc academic organizations such as interdisciplinary centers and the like. It argues that a limited number of student services are warranted, some of which deal with the essential logistics of institutional life and others which are explicitly designed to remove relatively superficial barriers to student academic performance. Thus, it supports modest counseling, guidance, and health services, but rejects long-term psychological or physiological therapy. And the book urges institutional acceptance of enrollment and financial decline as being far preferable to seeking constantly to expand activities essentially for reasons of financial expediency.

In arriving at such conservative recommendations the book examines the principal innovations of the 1960s and '70s and found most of them having made little impact on the mainstream of American higher education. Thus the net result of experimentation with the academic calendar seems to have been typically ending first semester or term courses before Christmas. Competency based education was adopted by only a few relatively weak institutions. Cluster colleges, with a few exceptions, did not prove to be particularly popular and attracted only a somewhat unique minority of college students.

The major lesson for all of American higher education is that those institutions which have remained reasonably faithful to their traditions are the ones in most stable financial condition, and the ones most likely to preserve academic and intellectual quality.

Chapter I

Quality in Higher Education

The concept of quality in higher education could be more seriously jeopardized during the 1980s and 1990s than at almost any other time in the history of American higher education. It should be pointed out that the quality of higher education has never been as good as its apologists claim nor as bad as one might infer from the periodic writings of educational reformers. Instruction in the past was frequently dull and pedestrian and the requirements for a degree all too frequently consisted of a mish-mash of courses held together by no particular logic. However, evidence from the thirties, forties, fifties and sixties all strongly implied that attending college did make a difference (C.R. Pace, 1979).

Challenge and Response of Higher Education

The history of American higher education since 1940 is a chronicle of responding effectively to a series of intense but quite different challenges. The first of these was coping with the almost forty percent drop in enrollment during the most intense period of World War II. With the aid of various military and other federal training programs, and helped by the departure for military or government duty of a number of professors, institutions were able to stay in operation and were not forced to make serious cutbacks in faculty strength. In addition to survival, many institutions took advantage of the pause in enrollments, to engage in serious curricular planning for the post-war era. The formal programs in general education, which flowered immediately after the end of hostilities, were frequently planned by under-utilized faculties during the war years.

The second response to challenge, of course, was to cope with the unexpectedly large number of veterans who opted to enter college with the

"G.I. Bill of Rights." Responsible educational leaders had estimated that probably no more than 700,000 veterans might enroll, (out of 11,000,000 people in service) whereas actually over 2,000,000 veterans attended college under the G.I. Bills. Institutions responded creatively by entering vigorously into temporary and permanent housing programs, by creating counseling, testing and guidance centers, by developing books of readings as substitutes for inadequate library holdings and lack of available textbook manuscripts and by putting into effect programs of general education designed to seek, in an attenuated form, the virtures of the previously maintained four-year program in liberal arts and sciences. These programs comprised approximately one-fourth of a bachelor's program and consisted of interdisciplinary courses in the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities. It can be argued that the major educational effort of the forty years, 1940-1980, consisted of an integration of those interdisciplinary programs in general education, and counseling, testing and guidance, and that these both derived directly from the planning during the war years and legitimating of them at the national level. During the decade following the end of the war perhaps the two most influential documents, with respect to the substance of higher education, were the Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society and the six volumes of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education.

The next great challenge was the response during the 1960s to what Ronald Thompson had called in 1954 the impending tidal wave of students. The post-war birthrates began to increase enormously in 1945, producing the large cohort groups of potential college students who would be beginning to apply in the early 1960s. The 1940 aggregated enrollment of one and a half million students would jump to 3,600,000 students in 1960 and almost 8,000,000 students in 1970. The response to this challenge was not so much curricular as material, and logistical. Campuses expanded, residence halls constructed, and throughout much of the late 1950s and 1960s new campuses were created on an average of one every other week. Graduate programs were increased substantially to produce the needed faculties, and inqenious schemes were developed to make use of retired faculty and to attract qualified people working in other industries. Just as World War II was won through the productive and organizing power of the United States, so the radically expanded demand for higher education was accommodated through a similar demonstration of productive and organizing power. During periods of a scant three years, decisions to create a new university campus would be converted into a multi-college institution with a reasonably full complement of undergraduate, professional, and graduate programs. During World War II new divisions were created around cadres of commissioned and noncommissioned officers drawn from existing divisions. During the 1960s something like that cadre system actually operated, with junior faculty members and administrators drawn from the senior institution in a state to form a cadre around which a new institution would be built. While no major curricular synthesis appeared - the general education movement had deteriorated - still the response to numbers represented a real flowering of the American system of higher education. Strong regional state universities and private institutions became national research centers, a powerful new system of junior colleges came into being and faculties were prepared and recruited reflecting a steady qualitative improvement in the form of increasing proportions of faculty members holding the Ph.D. This was done during a period, a part of which saw campuses torn by perhaps the worst dissension in the history of higher education in the United States. During even the worst excesses of campus protest, institutions accepted increasing enrollments and produced increasing numbers of graduates needed to man the steadily increasing national economy, and it was done without seriously reducing traditional standards of academic quality.

The next challenge was nationally more symbolic than real, although some institutions and even categories of institutions faced genuine threats. This challenge was the sudden onset, in about 1970, of what was to be called the new depression in higher education or the end of the bull market. Suddenly institutions saw a steadily widening gap between increases in incomes and increases in expenditures. Perhaps a third of all institutions found themselves in financial difficulties defined as inability to offer programs judged essential for the institution. Another third found themselves heading for financial difficulty, while the remaining third were in reasonable financial health. Some institutions began to experience stability or declining enrollments and a larger number began to expect declines before the end of the decade. Individual institutions and systems of institutions responded first managerially by reducing expenditures and improving budget making and budget managing so that by the mid-part of the decade many institutions had achieved a precarious financial equilibrium. Of course quite a few institutions had to cope with annual operating deficits through the period and the number of institutions closing or merging began to increase.

Nationally the overall accomplishment was healthy. Most institutions gained full-time equivalent enrollment, including private institutions, while the gap between tuition charged by private institutions and public institutions widened, yet privately paid tuition did not rise as fast as disposable family income. Overall the notion that institutions had been starved for money proved to be a myth as actual expenditures on instructional costs per student in constant dollars remained steady, and the states, even in the face of the unfavorable publicity deriving from the student protest movement, increased steadily the funds available for educational and general purposes. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education epitomized the situation at the end of the 1970s. "The 1970s, despite the 'new depression' period of recession early in the decade and the OPEC crisis in the Middle-East and contrary to the impression left by the many complaints and some cries of anguish, was a good decade for higher education. It was possibly the best decade in all of history, in terms of institutional progress, except for the 1960s. Higher education ended in the 1970s generally in good shape (Three Thousand Futures, 1980, p.13)."

Despite three decades of success, higher education faced in 1980 at least a two-decade future during which educational quality might be seriously threatened. There were several plausible views of that future, with a pessimistic one anticipating possible enrollment declines of forty or even fifty percent. Such declines in enrollment, coupled with inflation and redirection of public monies to other social purposes, could produce a serious crisis in the financing of higher education. Such a situation would force colleges and universities into bitter competition for students and resources which could directly affect adversely educational quality. Faculty members could react defensively to preserve their positions, thus blocking new intellectual blood from entering the professoriate. Students could, using their competitive advantage, force institutions into catering to their desires for less demanding work and for accelerating their receipt of diplomas.

There was also an optimistic view which saw enrollments even increasing as much as twenty-five to forty percent as older persons and foreign students took the place of missing eighteen to twenty-five year olds, and while resources might go down through a variety of factors, declines could be accommodated and the trend of three decades of expansion could allow institutions to turn their energies to the quality of education, with more time and thought being given to educating new and diverse student bodies in new and creative ways.

Although neither extreme view may become a reality, the overall condition of American higher education as it entered the 1980s presents to many institutions a challenge for survival and responding to that challenge could very well result in serious erosion of academic quality. The problem identified in the late 1960s by The Carnegie Commission of Higher Education of how to achieve quality and equality in higher education was even more acute during the 1980s and 90s than it was earlier. In some important regards the equality portion of that equation was at least partially achieved as the numbers of women, Blacks and other minorities entering college increased steadily during the 1970s. However, as those gains were taking place other developments were emerging with the potential for serious qualitative deterioration.

The Meaning of Academic Quality

Faculty Student Interaction

First, what is quality? In one sense academic or educational quality can be simply defined. It is that sort of education which children of the Rockefellers, Mellons or Kennedys are provided, but it can also be argued that quality education is exemplified by the core activities of collegiate institutions from the middle ages onward. The essence of the medieval university was that it made possible a life of study, whether for a few years or during an entire career made possible by bringing together, ". . . during that period, face-to-face in living intercourse, teacher and teacher, teacher and student, student and student. It would be a fatal error to imagine that either the multiplication of books or the increased facilities of communication can ever remove the need of institutions which permit such personal intercourse. The university, therefore, must have a local habitation; if it embraces colleges in different places you have virtually two or more universities in that one. Increased facilities of communication can never unite by the true university bond the inhabitants of distance towns; indeed it may be questioned whether the highest university ideal can be realized with the fullest perfection, even a single modern city, the largest type, especially where it does not possess a distinct university quarter (Rashdal, 1936, p.463)." A similar idea can be stressed for undergraduate education in the United States in the 1980s. Undergraduate education consists of preparing the young through the use of words, numbers and abstract concepts to understand, cope with and ultimately control the total environment in which they find themselves.

Characteristics of Quality Institutions

The nature of educational quality can also be inferred from the characteristics of places judged as maintaining quality and the outcomes which have been produced over time. It requires a highly and relevantly trained faculty possessing deep insights into the subjects they profess. It also requires highly motivated and adequately prepared students to cope with the sophisticated words, numbers and conceptualizations used to penetrate the essences of those subjects. It requires adequate and stable finances to support the extended time of faculty and students to generate an excellent educational experience, and it requires generally shared pride in the concept of quality and an unabashed thrust for ever increasing qualitative levels. By adequate and stable finances, the need for great wealth is not implied. But enough resources and the prospect for continuing resources to insure a stable environment is essential.

Residential Conditions

Quality does involve how people are grouped and how they interact. Although in some respects close to a majority of students enrolled as undergraduates in colleges and universities are commuters, nonetheless a residential situation, or a simulation of a residential situation, would seem to be essential if an institution is seeking educational quality. Education is a social and gregarious activity in which many of the important outcomes are generated by sustained and reasonably intimate interaction between students and students and students and faculty. This interaction is most likely to transpire in a residential situation and is least likely to happen when students remain on campus only long enough to appear in formal classes. Astin, using his own and other data, points out that, " . . . from an educational viewpoint cessation of dormitory construction and expansion of places for commuters (which took place in the 1970s) was a poor idea. In almost every respect, residents benefit more than commuters from their undergraduate experience. Residents not only show greater changes in personality and attitudes but also become more involved in campus life. Most important is the increased chance of persistence, which in turn maximizes the chance of implementing career plans. Residents are much more satisfied with their undergraduate experience than are commuters (Astin, 1977, p. 249)."

Criteria for Quality Programs

A different sort of qualitative consideration is how educational programs are created. There appears to be a growing tendency for institutions, especially low quality institutions, to create programs for whatever there is a real or potential student demand. While student demand is important, it should never be the determining factors. Courses and programs which stress quality should conform to several criteria rigorously imposed. Is the field or subject intellectually alive and growing? Does the field or subject attract people to specialize in it? Does the subject or field attract capable students and can students be placed in relevant positions after graduation? Does the field attract financial resources so that it may continue to flourish? Programs really do and should be produced through the interaction between an institution's history and tradition, the informed beliefs of faculty, student interest, and the social need and demand for graduates. Allow anyone to dominate, and educational distortion results. Stated another way it has been argued that there are at least four traditions of curriculum construction: (1) Great books (what every educated person needs to know, (2) Scientific teaching (techniques for modifying behavior), (3) Community or social needs (what sorts of people are needed), and (4) Individual student needs as seen by them. Quality would require a blend of all four and would be distorted by reliance on any single tradition.

Valued Quality Outcomes of Education

A different way of looking at this matter of quality is to examine what positive effects undergraduate education seems to have. Bowen summarizes much of what is known regarding outcomes of education, and that summary appears to be a reasonably attractive set of collegiate goals. "On the average college education significantly raises the level of knowledge, the intellectual disposition and the cognitive powers of its students. It produces a large increase in substantive knowledge; moderate increases in verbal skills; intellectual tolerance; aesthetic sensibility and lifelong cognitive development; and small increases in mathematical skills, rationality and creativity." " . . . On the average, college education helps students a great deal in finding their personal identity and in making lifelong choices congruent with this identity. It increases moderately their psychological well-being as well as their understanding, human sympathy, and tolerance toward other ethnic and national groups and toward people who hold differing opinions . . . . (Bowen, 1977, pp. 432-433)." To the extent that an institution has a faculty and resources likely to facilitate those developments and to the extent that visible efforts are made to achieve them, institutions could be judged as concerned with academic quality. If there is a general conception of quality, it must take into consideration the nature of the American system. The system (or more precisely a non-system) of higher education in the United States consists of many different types of institutions to serve the many kinds of students desiring it. There are junior colleges, liberal arts colleges, church-related colleges, regional universities, comprehensive universities, and comprehensive universities polarized around such things as science and technology. It should be recognized that all of these collegiate institutions share important purposes and values in common, and so, while there will be important differences between the small liberal arts college located in Appalachia and the research oriented university in California, both will share the important goal of inducting and socializing youth into American civilization and society.

Modern collegiate institutions do properly offer a variety of programs and activities that include many different preparations for vocations; preserving the culture through libraries, museums, and gallaries; and serving as a community intellectual resource. However, collegiate institutions are important but limited institutions that cannot and should not attempt to do too many things. Colleges and universities, for example, can have little effect on fundamental character traits such as honesty, optimism, or a sense of humour. Those are formed much earlier and through different media. Colleges and universities are at their best when they develop skills and abilities resting on the uses of words, numbers and abstract concepts. Institutions organized to emphasize other things, such as the joys of gardening, the cultivation of spirital serenity, or therapeutic self-expression, are not institutions of higher education, even though they may be quite laudable institutions that improve the human condition. Relatedly, in accomplishing principal purposes, collegiate institutions properly make use of many different techniques including field work, collection of artifacts, and even remunerative work closely related to academic work. However, the basic techniqes should continue to consist of reading and writing, numerical calculations, and practice in developing and using abstract concepts. These techniques are best developed through sustained and intensive interaction between teacher and student, and closely supervised independent effort, so that constant evaluation is done by informed individuals who help students perfect their cognative skills.

Qualitative Decline

Use of Part-Time Faculty

Solid evidence of qualitative decline is hard to find and the severity of decline, if it is taking or has taken place, is neither well understood nor documented. Overall, during the 1970s, there was a decline in faculty compensation and a significant decline in the amount of organized face-to-face contact between students and faculty. Toward the end of the 1970s permanent faculties had begun to age and many institutions began increasingly to use itinerant part-time faculty or to turn over, rather quickly, full-time faculty appointments at the lower academic ranks. The significance of this use of temporary itinerant or rapidly rotating faculty is underscored by Bowen. He pointed out that as colleges and universities began to employ part-time faculty they really did not become part of the collegial faculty responsible for educational policy. "Higher education has always used part-time faculty, and there surely is a place for them if used sparingly and wisely. They can lend flexibility and variety, bring practical knowledge and experience into the academic community, and make available the services of outstanding people who could not be employed on any other basis. But in recent years, when the reason for using part-time people often has been financial, and when any of them could bring nothing to the academic community that full-time members could not supply, the increased use of part-time staff probably represented deterioration of quality" (Bowen, 1980, p.219).

Curricular Decline

Throughout the 1970s the academic aptitude of entering college students declined as did their preparation in academic subjects such as English, mathematics and history. Even as those deficiencies became apparent, colleges and universities reduced requirements in English, mathematics, foreign languages and especially science. Throughout higher education there was a marked tendency to allow students to devise ". . . their own degree programs out of bits and pieces of academic work gathered from scattered off-campus courses, accreditation of independent study, and practical experience. A great deal of education was happening without carefully designed programs, without depth or breadth of learning, and, as indicated earlier, without benefit of libraries, laboratories, a cultural ambiance of the campus and the particpation of fully qualified faculty. In their preoccupation with the market, some institutions all but abdicated their professional roles as designers of curriculums and as arbitrators of standards. And many gave up their traditional concern for the all-around development of the human personality in favor of counting disparate credits that may or may not add up to education in its traditional meaning. The result was a serious weakening in liberal education including reduced emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, foreign languages, mathematics, history, philosophy, natural sciences, and other subjects essential to producing well educated men and women (Ibid, p. 223).

The decline in collegiate graduation requirements was especially vexing in connection with general education, which the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching labeled a disaster area for a variety of reasons which will be discussed in Chapter III. General education began a precipitous decline in about 1960. That decline was especially significant with respect to the larger numbers of poorly prepared students who began to enter college at just about the time general education was deteriorating. The turn of the century elective college curriculum could and did meet reasonably well the educational needs of well prepared college students in the first half of the twentieth century. In a sense they had at least the rudiments of a reasonably balanced education. In view of the apparent failure of secondary schools to prepare newer kinds of students and the backing off of colleges from general education requirements, makes almost inevitable the production of millions of degree holders who simply are not educated in the historical sense of that term.

Another clear manifestation of deterioration in quality is the continuing sharp grade inflation. In study after study grades in virtually all types of institutions have been inflated; for example, a Carnegie Foundation report indicated that the percentage of A's and B's awarded to undergraduates nationwide increased from 54% in 1969 to 74% in 1976. This matter will be elaborated in Chapter III, but in this context it is appropriate to cite the observation (admittedly somewhat extreme) of Copperman that, "Grade inflation penalizes the superior, the talented, and the hard working and rewards the mediocre, incompetent and lazy. It produces a kind of intellectual fantasyland, where everybody is superior. It teaches America's brightest young people that there is no particular merit attached to hard work. It is a measure of the deterioration of our institutions of higher education (Copperman, 1978, p. 116)."

Of considerable greater significance and the actual documented decline of academic quality are the various potentialties for decline which could well be realized if remedial steps are not taken. One optimistic phenomenon is that some of the higher education organizations finally began, in the early 1980s, to discuss matters of academic quality and to identify potential trouble spots. The American Council on Education established a national commission on higher education issues which decided that the two large concerns which would first occupy the attention of the commission would be a consideration of strengthening the place of quality as a core value of American higher education as the first, with the second being reforming of basic governance and finance structures in higher education. The quality pattern was to be explored by seeking answers to eight central concerns. These questions clearly imply that the commission sees danger signs developing:

1. What should be done to retain public confidence in the integrity of colleges and universities by adopting policies that ensure that their performance is internally rigorous and externally justifiable?

2. What reforms should be advocated in current accreditation procedures with special emphasis on instruction offered in nontraditional settings, off-campus programs, and admissions-marketing programs?

3. What policies should institutions adopt to strengthen faculty performance, especially in teaching, by encouraging flexibility in faculty career patterns and adjusting institutional personnel practices?

4. What procedures should be advocated to measure the quality of institutional performance and provide better information about quality to consumers and payers?

5. What policies and programs should institutions adopt to encourage intellectual motivation of students, including advancing the intellectual quality of students before they enter college and aiding gifted students;

6. What responsibility does government and the private sector have for encouraging higher education quality with special emphasis on reallocating resources and adjusting state funding formulas?

7. What minimum standards should be adopted for the baccalaureate and associate degrees?

8. How should trustees, working with administrative and faculty leaders, advance the quality of their institutions? (Change Magazine, October, 1981, p. 52)

Also indicative of concern are serious attempts to measure quality in higher education which will be faithful to abstractions about quality, yet which will take into account the variety of types of institutions and their purposes which is an essential of the United States higher educational system. Voluntary regional accreditation is deeply involved in this quest. The associations have a serious problem, especially in dealing with many new institutions which probably cannot fairly be judged by some previous techniques but which should nevertheless be examined and evaluated. Hidden under the overall rubric of new institutions are some which quite likely are providing high quality but different educational service, as well as institutions whose practices may come perilously close to being fradulent.

One potential threat must be mentioned although whether or not it will produce unfortunate results has yet to be known. This is the continuous increase in tuition and fees at the prestigious pace setting private colleges and universities. The stronger of these began during the 1970s, the general practice of increasing tuition and fees at approximately two percent more than increases in the consumer index. There could very well come a time when in spite of the generally recognized quality of such institutions, they will simply be too expensive for all but the children of the quite affluent. If the Dartmouths, Yales, Chicagos, and Stanfords of the country begin to weaken, they will most surely be followed by the next tier of instititutions. The first qualitative injury would be symbolic, but nonetheless real. In so many respects, the prestige private institutions have been pace setting in maintaining academic and intellectual freedom, improving the condition of the professoriate and occasionally demonstrating a direction in which educational reform might move. The serious effort of Stanford and Harvard in 1980 to restore structure to the undergraduate curriculum is an example of that latter point. To elaborate this point with an example, several private universities have maintained schools of education which were regarded as exemplary and which established styles in the preparation of educators which affected what most institutions did. As the tuitions at those private universities increased, enrollments in professional education decreased to such a point that by 1982 several schools, such as the one at Duke University, were eliminated, andeven the highly ranked ones such as the one at Stanford experienced such enrollment drops as to be cause for serious concern on the part of central administration.

Another potential threat to quality is also conjectural. That is that the drying up of academic positions during the late 1970s and 1980s would deny secure academic appointments to the young assistant professors who, in normal times, would have been expected to be the scholarly and intellectual leaders by the beginning of the twenty-first century. Of course, there likely will always be some room for appointments of junior faculty, and by the mid-1990s there could very well be a large number of vacancies as professors appointed in the 1960s approach retirement. However, the fact that the prestige institutions across the country were in the 1980s tenured in at between 70 and 80%, hence unable to appoint assistant professors, makes very plausible an overall decline in scholarship which then results in a decline in new disciplinary materials needed for education. Since World War II there were two big increases in faculty appointments. The first of these came at the end of the war in order to accommodate the veteran enrollment, and the second came in the 1960s to accommodate the post World War II increased birth rates. Members of both of those cohort groups have gained permanent tenure and with the federally changed age at which mandatory retirement can be imposed, the first large cohort group will be retiring in the late 1980s and early 90s, and the second large cohort group retiring ten years later. Maintaining the continuity of intellectual effort is such a complex and delicate matter that it is quite conceivable that both the 1980s and 1990s will seriously unsettle the ecology of research, scholarship and education, based on those two sources.

Still another potential drop in quality could be that the lower standards for the awarding of academic degrees in some institutions might dilute and discredit the meaning of those degrees throughout the country. One possible result, and very likely the most probable, would be the defacto creation of two categories of the same degrees. Thus there would continue to be respect for bachelors degrees from the most eminent of both public and private colleges and universities, and a general recognition that the same degrees from other institutions were qualitatively significantly different. But there is always the possibility that when the same bachelor degrees require one year of work at one institution and four at others and as the numbers of people acquiring those degrees increases, the degree itself might fall into disregard and a search launched for some new degree connoting quality. By the early 1980s there were serious suggestions advanced that perhaps a new super doctoral degree was needed to signify true research capability, in view of other substantial increases in production of doctorates from institutions with little or no research, tradition or competency.

But of greatest potential danger for the concept of academic quality and its actual realization has been the emergence of a new educational ideology which called into question or actually rejected historic qualitative standards with much of that ideology put into effect in a wide range of institutions. Chapter III will focus on that new ideology, however the basic tenets of that doctrine posing a threat to quality are mentioned here.

One of the basic tenets of the reforming doctrine is that the substance of collegiate education should be whatever a constituency wants it to be instead of what trained and informed opinion holds that it should be. In urging such a criterion reformers claim a universal service role for collegiate institutions. Not at all immodestly, one spokesman suggested that, a college for community renewal must no longer be just an agency to provide service to the community; it must be a vital participant in the total renewal process of the community. Such a college will be committed not just to degrees and credentials, not to just job training, and not just to service for the community. It will rather be committed to the continued improvement of all aspects of community life and dedicated to the continued growth and development of its citizens and its social institutions. It will assume responsibility for helping to create the revolution in educational expectations as well as insuring the success of this cause.

The reform doctrine of the 1970s was the base of what came to be called the nontraditional movement. Thus the Commission on Nontraditional Study argued that the first set of patterns is woven around the philosophy of full educational opportunity. Its goal is to assure each individual, regardless of age, previous formal education, or circumstances of life, the amount of type of education that will add to and develop his potential as a person." To achieve that goal there had to be elements of structure, method, content, and procedures that combine to create a new flexibility in education. This will require calling seriously into question historic educational virtues of intensity and continuity of study, the traditional subjects and modes of study and the use of trained professional faculty. The Commission seems almost to urge substitution for professional faculty, with instruction being assumed by business, industry, labor unions, cultural, governmental and social agencies, military commands, proprietary schools, correspondence institutes and others and it assigns considerable prescience to individuals by suggesting each student searches for the kind of education suitable and necessary for himself, and individualized responsibility, whereby each student having decided on his educational goal and course of action documents his motivation by satisfactory progress toward his goal. Just how individuals are expected to develop such insights is not indicated.

Another tenet seems to reject any validity for specialized, organized and focused study by proclaiming that all knowledge regardless of where acquired and that all behavior regardless of how modified is worthy of academic credit. Such a point of view would support granting academic credit for an annual physical examination, having been audited by the Internal Revenue Service, taking a course featuring films of auto accidents in lieu of paying a fine for a traffic citation, witnessing and being moved by televised scenes of earthquake destruction, or a husband accompanying a pregnant wife into a delivery room. All of these can produce useful knowledge and all presumably change behavior in reasonably sophisticated ways. It is the widespread adoption of this tenet which allows assigning college academic credit to displaced Vietnamese for learning basic English and for citizens in the Seattle area learning what to look for when they visit a display of Egyptian art.

Reasons for Decline in Quality

While the reasons for qualitative decline in education are many and complex three forces were particularly potent. These have been implied earlier but require elaboration. The first of these was the commendable effort on the part of higher education to enroll major segments of youth not previously exposed to higher education such as minority group members, the economically disadvantaged, and women. Especially the first two groups had experienced serious educational deficiencies in their elementary and secondary education, hence they arrived on campus unable to cope with traditional higher educational practice. In order to serve these students, institutions not only created varieties of remedial services, but also began to modify requirements for the sake of poorly prepared students. As an example, the School of Engineering at the University of Houston developed a special program for Black engineering students which provided a great deal of counseling and guidance and allowed students to meet requirements over a greatly extended period without being vulnerable to receiving failing grades. Even the ever optimistic Bowen pointed out that a significant slippage in educational quality declined as higher education sought to serve those new groups of students. He believed that bringing them into college was probably wise ". . . even though the results were not completely satisfactory (and) the qualitative results have not yet matched those of traditional higher education (Bowen, 1980).

A second and probably a more powerful force for deteriorating quality was institutional worry over enrollments and finances. In order to attract students, requirements were modified, the amount of classroom contact was reduced, grading standards were eased, academic credit was more easily granted, and new programs were created and advertised even though institutions lacked expertise to do so. Throughout this book examples are presented of these changing practices which, while defended in the name of social ameliorism and educational reform, were in essence economically motivated to gain tuition or enrollment driven appropriations. The potency of this economic force can be illustrated in a number of ways. If a private institution can eliminate budgetary deficits by offering qualitatively questionable, but still defensible programs will it be able to resist the temptation to do so? This quest for economic stability, took in aggregate, many forms having qualitative implications, with the first and probably least dangerous being eliminating or downgrading entrance requirements to little more than high school graduation. Many private institutions were so unselective as to accept virtually all students who applied if they had a high school diploma. This is probably a benign return to the pre-World War II admissions condition in which most institutions accepted all or a great majority of high school graduates who applied. The great state universities of the midwest, such as the University of Illinois or Ohio State University, accepted all citizens having a high school diploma and the incipient national institutions, such as Harvard, accepted one out of every one-and-a-half students who applied, with a substantial majority of those coming from New England and the New York City metropolitan area, and the various indexes of quality of those institutions at that time did not differ markedly from those of 1980.

However, institutions have engaged in, or are tempted to engage in, a variety of other practices some of which can be seriously questioned. These would include cosmetically creating presumably attractive programs and zealously advertising them even though the institution might not have requisite intellectual resources to offer programs. Relatedly are the unrestrained admissions efforts to recruit foreign students, including but casual attention to immigration forms and procedures or ability to cope with academic work. Then there is the pro-forma automatic admissions of categories of students such as children of all graduates or children of friends of the institution. To these should be added the proliferating of degree programs which require minimal formal class contact and generous award of academic credit for military or other work experience and a variety of educational experiences whether providing a consistent pattern or not. A typical example would be programs in business administration or public service which would grant the equivalent of three years academic credit based on a portfolio listing presumably relevant experiences and requiring one thirty-week academic year with a one three-hour class each week. In one extreme form of an unaccredited institution, the Ph.D. was awarded on the basis of a previously acquired master's degree, a paid position in an education institution, one five-week summer session, a thesis written under the direction of some local acquaintance and a two-week summer session to integrate experiences, take an oral examination and go through graduation ceremonies. There are hundreds of institutions offering whatever programs a group of potential students seem to desire, to be offered wherever they desire it and scheduled to the convenience of the students' work schedules. The reality of motivation for such activities are the experiences of some institutions which have elminated a million or more dollars a year of operating deficits through offering less expensive programs than the on-campus counterparts, and which yield high net tuition income. The secret, or not so secret, ingredients for these programs consists of utilizing part-time, cheap labor in the form of adjunct professors, relying on a great deal of self-services, labeled independent study, and making use of low or no-cost physical facilities, such as a school building on Saturdays, an office building or even the homes of students or adjunct faculty.

The rationale to justify such programs uses the rhetoric of need fulfillment, service, democracy or breaking the rigidity of traditional academic programs. Thus the shortened doctoral program responds to the traditional criticisms of doctoral education, of high specialization and frequently an extended time required to earn the degree. The once-a-week program leading to a bachelors degree in public service is explained as being an educationally valid way to accommodate the work needs of students,and the one-year bachelors program in an institution in a ghetto is described as a Black response to Black needs which have not been served by traditional institutions. The dangers to quality should be obvious. Meeting an instructor once a week or once a month, regardless of the qualifications of the instructor, make plausible at least, superficial treatment of topics. Expecting fully employed individuals to spend much of their study time by themselves is to risk, first, superficial study, and second, to eliminate the powerful educational force of steady, consistent interaction with other students. And the use of far distant, part-time faculty minimizes the amount of formal and informal monitoring which on a campus generally assures reasonable fidelity to the tasks of education. Not all institutions, of course, engage in such activities. Those which do are frequently private institutions of all sizes with little national prestige and a precarious tuition-driven budget, or public institutions seeking to increase full-time equivalent student bodies for the sake of increased appropriations.

A third force or factor is the extraordinary difficulty of discussing quality and defining it without appearing to be undemocratic and insensitive to the needs of segments of the population previously excluded from collegiate education. John Gardner tried to avoid that pitfall by insisting that quality (or excellence as he called it) was needed both by plumbers and philosophers. Yet when he came to exemplify excellence his examples were of the traditional academic sort and he never got around to showing how different but equal quality standards could be used for other situations.

Aeltason, president of the American Council on Education, reflected a similar ambilivance in conferences proceedings entitled, Quality, Higher Education's Principle Challenge (Stauffer, 1979). "In the higher education community, our most precious asset is public confidence. If we are to keep that confidence, we must maintain quality in the academic and other missions which the public has entrusted to our enterprise. If we fail to do so, the public will, rightfully, withhold it support. The challenge to realize the highest possible standards is never ending, and it is also what makes an academic career worthwhile. The challenge to maintain quality should not be interpreted as a sweeping plea to establish high admission standards and a ruthless grading system. Quality institutions are not confined to those with highly selective admissions, although quality may be easier to maintain in such institutions than in those whose mandate is to provide open educational opportunity. High quality may be found among open admission institutions, as inferior quality may be found among highly selective institutions. Whether the mission is off-campus or on-campus instruction, a university without walls or one with an ivory tower, a two or four-year program, a research or teaching orientation or some combination thereof, secular or religious, the challenge to maintain quality is always before us (Ibid, p.)." Such generalities, which are safe, become dangerous when examined for specific details. Such an examination must respond to questions as to the comparability of degrees granted to the highly literate, and degrees granted to the seriously illiterate. The issue must be faced as to the comparability of student learning through sustained intensive interaction with a highly qualified faculty member, and the learning which takes place through essentially independent study with only occasional contact with the competent professor. It is really to suggest how those issues might be faced that this book was written.

The debate over academic quality involves some central public attitudes and public policy issues. The first of these, and by far the most transcendent, involves an over-elaboration of individuals' rights in a democractic society. Underlying the quest for new students, especially on the part of public institutions, is the growing belief that individuals have the right to be educated up to whatever capacities they possess, for whatever purposes they choose, and whenever they want it. Considerable of the polemical literature in favor of that position is full of poignant vignettes of, for example, a seventy-year old woman who had always wanted a bachelor's degree and was finally able to obtain one through a flexible, off-campus oriented program for adults offered by a tax-supported regional four-year college. Various reformers contend that some period of post-secondary education (one or two years typically) should be guaranteed each individual, to be taken whenever it is most convenient in the individual's life cycle. Educators tend to like such a point of view because it provides a rationale for ever increasing enrollments which they argue they can serve by new and innovative approaches to teaching. Ernest L. Boyer is one of the most persuasive and respected voices arguing for such rights and for such changes in pedagogy. In one especially comprehensive essay, after the ritual criticizing of the historic lockstep of undergraduation education designed to serve 18-22 year olds, he advances his major pleas. "Even though the baby boom has slackened, there are still more people to be served. Mid-career people have more leisure time, and they face the crisis of early obsolescence. Older people now retire earlier, live longer, have more free time, and are often socially unattached. Now we have blocks of freedom throughout all of life, and for the first time in our history, education may be viewed not only as a prework tradition but as a process to be pursued from 18 to 85. Our job in higher education is to construct new educational arrangements to meet the changing social patterns (Boyer, 1974, p. 7)."

He then illustrates what he has in mind with some programs offered by the State University of New York and then launches into his peroration using, as so many similar-minded spokesmen do, the somewhat strained analogy, "If we can go into the factories, why can't we also go into the nursing homes and the retirement villages? Why should a person after a lifetime of productive work be allowed to vegetate intellectually simply because of the physical impairments of age? The individual should pay for learning, of course, if he can, but we have medicare for the body; why not educare for the mind? The cost would be modest but the returns would be enormous (Ibid, p. 9)." He then demonstrates a belief in a new pedagogy emphasizing new courses, new schedules and new faculty attitudes and a faith in the qualities of older students of high motivation and great intellectual diligence.

There are several problems with this entire argument, with the first being the validity of the premise of rights at public expense to higher education. This can be seriously questioned, first, by the legal fact that education is nowhere mentioned among the inalienable rights of citizens. Secondly, it can be questioned by the historic tradition that higher education was supported by the public to obtain necessary kinds of individuals. The colonial colleges were designed to produce ministers and other sorts of leaders, the land grant colleges were designed to produce the sorts of technical workers needed to subdue, cultivate and develop a continental sized land-mass. The great late nineteenth century benefactors of private higher education created institutions to produce specific kinds of skilled individuals which society needed, and actually, the much and properly-lauded G.I. Bill of Rights was created more to ease the shock on the labor market of returning veterans than as an expression of inherent right to education. A more conservative rationale for the 1980s and 90s could be argued. Federal and state governments properly could support higher education because the people and the nation need military officers, medical doctors and a great variety of other sorts of technical workers, but a similar justification of providing education to fill leisure hours is difficult to support unless the rather far-fetched argument is used that filling leisure hours might prevent social revolution.

One further argument against the right of everyone to subsidized education for whatever purpose is the matter of resources. Although the productive power of the United States is still great, its resources are not infinite and are insufficient to provide for every conceivable individual need, even needs such as housing for everyone, a need which can be dramatically documented. Among social needs preeminent over the need for what has been called recurrent education can be listed, internal security, some level of health protection, and welfare and retirement benefits.

A second major need for clarification before the quality matter can be addressed directly is simply nomenclature. For over 300 years there has been considerable deviation from ideals, nonetheless the phrases higher education or higher learning implied a direct qualitative norm. It suggested what was and was not appropriate for colleges and universities to do. However, during the 1970s, at the urgings of various reformers and reform groups first, and then through direct federal action, the term post-secondary education came into vogue as an umbrella for an enormous range of activities extending from counseling programs on death and dying to Ph.D. programs in theoretical physics and post-doctoral programs in esoteric medical specialties. The very term then allowed institutions to undertake almost every conceivable kind of service and justify it as appropriate for a post-secondary education. While quite likely the clock will never be turned back, a more honest educational policy position would be to say, as many other industrialized nations say, there is higher education on the one hand and all other kinds of post-secondary educational services on the other and they are in no way equivalent.

It would thus be hopeful as a background for more specific steps to maintain or improve academic quality if there could be clarification of these two matters: that there is no inherent right of people to some amount of subsidized higher education for whatever purposes and obtained at whatever time, that there should be a clear recognition as to what is called higher education and other sorts of educational services rather than considering all educational services as equal expressions of a single entity - post-secondary education and there should be extended debate as to the meaning and achievement of quality.

Quality Problem Institutions

The traditional concept of academic quality does not seem seriously to be jeopardized in well established, financially strong colleges and universities, although there has been some deterioration in some of those. Grade inflation is found in Ivy League institutions and an increased need for remedial work is found in senior, research oriented universities. However, in three types of institutions academic quality matters are of critical significance.

The publically supported two-year community junior college is clearly one of these. This highly publicized, expanding type of institution, in many respects, stands as the antithesis of the qualitative matters subsequently to be discussed. Academically, community junior college faculties are less well prepared than those in four-year institutions, with the master's degree being the typical degree in academic subjects, and no degree required in many of the vocational fields. Academically, the student bodies are less able than in four-year institutions (with, of course, considerable overlap from the standpoint of both high school academic records and measured test performance). The considerable majority of students who enroll as freshmen in community junior college either do not finish the first year, or do not re-enroll for a second year, and only approximately ten percent of students who enroll as freshmen subsequently receive a bachelor's degree from someplace. Although, typically, community junior colleges have some form of general education requirements leading to an associate degree, only a minority of students fulfill those requirements, either because they find the work too difficult or irrelevant to their vocational plans. If, as Astin argued, there is considerable educational significance to residential collegiate education, the very nature of community junior colleges denies them that potential. They are commuting institutions, and typical student behavior is to commute to campuses in time for classes, departing immediately after the last one. Of course, a few students participate in clubs, student government, athletics, but the majority seem to rely exclusively on classrooms for educational impact. Further, if there is validity to the historic contention that collegiate education derives out of intense research and scholarship, the community junior college would again appear to be deficient. One of the claims of community junior college education is that faculties do not do research, hence are able to devote more time to teaching; which should result in much better education. After visiting faculties of twenty colleges during 1979 and '80, my impression was that, as a group, they did not read very much in their field or out of them, that they undertook relatively little further education in the subject they taught, and that, intellectually, individuals did not appear particularly interesting. They did, however, argue generally for an egalitarian educational philosophy which demanded that their institutions provide whatever kind of services their communities desired.

The difficulty community junior colleges experience with respect to a somewhat narrow view of intellectual or academic quality is revealed in the purposes institutions seek. First, there are the five or six generally accepted statements of purpose: transfer programs containing the first two years of a bachelor's degree, general education, technical-vocational education, adult and continuing education, serving as a community cultural center, and providing counseling to help students make difficult personal, academic, and career decisions. Achievement of these purposes is varied. Among students who do transfer to four-year institutions, after a difficult transfer semester or term, student performance is comparable to performance of native four-year students. However, across the country, such a small proportion of all students do transfer that it is difficult to establish that subsequent successful performance is more attributable to the two-year institution than to intellectual, personality, or motivational traits of individual students themselves. The general education courses, for the most part, do not appear any better or worse than such courses in four-year institutions. However, a rather common phenomenon is for the institutions to offer several levels of general education courses, some of which are distinctly remedial. Again, full sets of such requirements, with the implication that something of integrating value comes out of completing a full set is relatively small. Technical-vocational programs and adult continuing education programs reflect an enormous range of variety -- so great that it is difficult to make qualitative judgments. There are engineering programs stressing reasonably basic physical science and mathematics, and there are straight skills courses, such as gunsmithing.

There are courses in modern language and courses stressing purely avocational themes.

A different approach to purpose may be inferred from what the institutions actually appears to do. The first of these is to serve as the total institutional counseling and advising effort, which quickly shows freshmen whether or not a baccalaurete degree program is appropriate for them. In California, for example, some 80 percent of high-school graduates enter colleges or universities with the majority entering two-year community colleges, yet the vast majority of those who enter complete neither an associate degree nor a bachelor's degree. They experienced a college or a university and decided that was not for them. Burton Clark labeled this phenomenon a "cooling-out function," and a reasonably strong case can be made that, although expensive, cooling out through experience is more consistent with democratic ideals than cooling out through examinations, such as is true in other industrial democracies.

Another inference, is that two-year public junior colleges, as colleges, serve as a safety-valve for lower-class feelings and aspirations which led them to want a collegiate experience. At the same time, the total collegiate system, with its elite institutions, allowed the middle and upper-middle classes to maintain possession of positions of preference. In effect, the American system offered every high school graduate the opportunity to enter higher education, but at the same time, was so structured and conducted that less able individuals did not persist to an academic degree. An additional function in this connection is that the community junior college also serves as a second chance for under-achieving children of the middle classes to enter academic routes leading to positions of preference. Such individuals not admissible to elite institutions upon graduation from high school, still could enter two-year colleges and, after a time, mature sufficiently for entry into baccalaureate-degree granting institutions and professional schools.

The validity of such a point of view is suggested by the strong support given two-year community colleges by academic leadership throughout the country, and by political leadership. The academic leadership seems frequently to see the two-year institutions as a means of caring for students with whom senior institutions cannot be bothered. Political leadership seems to see the two-year college as a relatively inexpensive way of accommodating the expanding educational aspirations in the nation.

Still a different view of two-year college purpose is found in statements which proclaim the two-year college as a major new social institution capable of serving communities in an almost infinite set of ways. The enormity of this view is reflected by the language spokesmen use affirming that a revolution is underway in the United States which can be serviced and given focus by two-year institutions: "Everywhere, men and women are beginning to realize that the education that they received in the past, regardless of how little or how much, cannot sustain them for long in a time of rapid change. They sense that the world in which they live is no longer the world they have known, that the nation is undergoing deep and ever-accelerating changes, and that even the community or neighborhood in which they live no longer offers the comfort of continuity. They recognize that unless they take preventive action, they will become as obsolete as last year's headlines. They are discovering that if they wish to remain in touch with the reality of an ever-changing, ever-new present, they must change themselves -- that the only way to survive in a world where so much is new every day, is to develop a process of continual self-renewal. They are demanding opportunities for renewal and leadership to show them the way (Gollattscheck, et al, 1976, p.2)."

Clearly, the two-year community junior college is different from traditional bachelor's degree-awarding institutions, and many things they do are qualitatively different from those things done in the four-year institutions. And it is also clear, as evidenced by enrollment trends, that such institutions are increasingly popular. However, perplexities remain which, if not solved, at least should be examined. Should academic credit signifying progress toward an academic degree be awarded for courses in elementary reading, in an institution over half of whose students read at below the fifth-grade level? Some would say yes, and some would say absolutely no, except for cohesive courses in the traditional arts and sciences.

There are, however, compromises. One solution would be to award academic credit only for certain kinds of programs, while awarding a credential or certificate for work done which is of a non-academic nature. A second compromise could be achieved through public appropriations, with money supplied for only certain kinds of programs, but with institutions free to offer whatever other service they wish, provided it could be financially self-sustaining. A third compromise would be through the transfer process, with four-year institutions establishing clear guidelines of what credit would be acceptable and what would not be acceptable. A similar result could be achieved through the use of standardized examinations to validate what credit could be acceptable and what would not be acceptable.

Since such compromises are not likely to prove acceptable, perhaps the best solution would be the continuation of the somewhat expensive but informal technique of the credentialing and award-granting system of covertly accepting some kind of academic credit, but rejecting other sorts. Such an instrumental position is certainly consistent with national history and tradition.

A second kind of institution in which academic quality can be seriously threatened is the quite small privately supported liberal arts college, frequently 100 or more years old, which historically served young people of the vicinity in which the institutions was located, typically, by preparing them to become public or parochial school teachers. As long as they operated basically on low tuition and almost the contributed services of inadequately compensated faculty and as long as there was a sustained market for their products, these institutions could maintain a reasonably qualitative posture. However, as the cost of salaries and other sorts of goods and services began to mount at the same time that the number of tuition free or low tuition public institutions began to increase, these institutions found themselves in serious enrollment and economic situations. Their former clientele no longer afford their increased tuition and the institutions lacked reputations which would attract students from outside the region who would and could pay tuition and fees. That situation which had begun in the 1960s was exacerbated in the early 1970s when the need for elementary and secondary school teachers began seriously to soften. These institutions then found themselves accepting virtually any high school graduate who applied offering them whatever kind of program their leaders thought might attract and hold students.

Rather quickly during the 1970s these institutions began to reflect qualitative deficiencies. Increasingly the academic aptitude of entering students began to decline after a brief period of limited increases in aptitude and academic achievement during the 1960s. By the end of the 1970s they were generally not much more selective than were publicly supported two-year community junior colleges. As enrollments dropped and tuition income decreased these institutions first had to limit the number of instructors in the several programs so that one or two-person departments came to be the rule. When that strategy proved to be ineffective then low attraction fields such as most foreign languages were eliminated or were taught by part-time instructors who could be recruited locally. Library holdings were allowed to deteriorate as was also laboratory equipment and other educational materials. When even those measures proved to be insufficient many such institutions turned to creating new programs which it was hoped would attract enough new students to provide a reasonable cash flow. Thus, some institutions began to offer week-end college work for such groups as mature women while others began to contract with businesses and industry to offer specialized programs such as bachelor's degrees in business administration, even though the institution had never had experience with professional degree programs in business. Unfortunately, the weaker and more threatened these institutions became the more new inadequately supported and monitored programs they sought to develop in the hopes of gaining additional tuition revenue. One dramatic illustration of this phenomenon was an institution with an on-campus constituency of 700 students trying to serve 10,000 students in locations across the United States through over 50 different kinds of programs with inadequate administrative support or supervision and coordination. These off-campus units used whatever part-time faculty which could be recruited locally who were left essentially to the conduct of their own affairs. In this one example regional accreditation finally forced retrenchment under the serious threat of withdrawing accredited status. The large majority, however, of the several hundred liberal arts colleges undertaking such efforts continued to get by the periodic accreditation visits and to remain as accredited institutions.

The deviations from recognized good educational practice found in these institutions are many but can be illustrated by just a few citations. These would include expecting that a faculty member trained in history would also teach literature and a general course in social science, employing as part-time instructors from the vacinity, individuals having a native facility in foreign language with no formal preparation other than having been reared in the language and having completed a secondary school education, or sending students to near-by community colleges or state colleges to enroll in courses the institution was unable to offer.

It is somewhat paradoxical that financial difficulties during the late 1970s and early 1980s led institutions to take a number of steps involving quality, whereas during earlier periods of financial stress such actions for the most part were not taken. During the depression of the 1930s, salaries of full-time professors were cut, but as a general rule full-time members were not replaced by lesser trained part-time faculty members. Although admission standards in most institutions in the 1930s were typically nothing more than high school graduation, institutions did not attempt to solve the problem of drops in enrollment by such modifications of admission standards as accepting high school juniors or seniors or recruiting older people, nor did institutions generally modify curricula seriously to shape them to the unique needs of many different groups of people.

The third type of institution in which academic quality is likely to be in jeopardy is the relatively new privately supported, tuition supported institution created since about 1970 to serve some one or several of presumed new clientels. These would include new humanisticaly oriented liberal arts colleges, law schools designed for part-time students with courses taught by part-time faculties, for profit educational brokering services which will create a program, develop a curriculum and employ a faculty for whichever subject there appears to be a tuition paying market, or free standing doctoral programs in psychology taught by part-time faculty members recruited from private practice. These sorts of institutions were typically created in the wake of the nontraditional movement and used the rhetoric of social service to rationalize their activities. While in theory what many of them claim to do can be done, nonetheless, in aggregate their practices and processes leave considerable concern for quality. They typically have little financial reserve and rely on tuition for all expenditures, including capital ones, hence, do not impose rigorous admissions standards. Their physical plant is typically rented space originally designed for other purposes. Their library holdings are limited, expecting students to use library facilities of other institutions. Their faculties are, for the most part, part-time who do little more than teach formal courses, often held at night and meeting far less frequently than courses in long established institutions. Their students are also part-time, attending class at night after a days work with fatigue likely to dull their educational effort. Their student support services are likely to be minimal, and even when provided, rarely used because of lack of student time. And all too frequently to attract working students who want a degree but who have limited time, graduation requirements are modest, with considerable credit given for prior experience and with less than normal actual classroom contact with professors actually required. These institutions have received considerable attention from regional accreditation which has been uneasy regarding many of their practices, but which, by 1982, had still been unable to deal with them.

In the following chapters many elements of higher education will be examined as they pertain to academic quality. In anticipation of that, an agenda of issues is advanced which would seem to require solutions.

1. Can academic credit be sufficiently defined that quality can be partially achieved through control of the granting of academic credit?

2. Can the nature of higher education and its purposes be sufficiently defined and clarified as to enable institutions, government and the public to recognize what is and is not appropriate collegiate activity?

3. Can institutions be persuaded to limit what they will undertake in the face of serious financial difficulties?

4. Can the two goals of quality and equality be reconciled and brought into relative balance?

The New Reforming Establishment

If ideas have consequences, then any systematic investigation of academic and intellectual quality should include consideration of various ideas concerning quality. In other chapters of this book, there has been repeated mention of ideas of some reformers active during the 1970s, however, ideas of critics and spokemen for higher education may be sufficiently important to warrant additional and focused discussion. Jencks and Riesman spoke of the academic revolution as being the emergence of the American professoriate as a self-selecting, self-directing, self-evaluating group of professionals, free to conduct their affairs essentially as they saw fit, according to the cannons which they developed (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). However, an even more profound revolution may have taken place, as an earlier, generally acceptable synthesis of higher education as essentially an intellectual undertaking, gave way, at least in part, to the notion that higher education was essentially a social meliorist, service-providing institution, obligated to provide whatever kinds of service anyone wanted. That revolution may very well be the central issue in the matter of academic quality. Two major issues are involved in this connection: (1) the validity or invalidity of the reforming ideas, and (2) how likely they are to be widely adopted.

Conceptions of Higher Education Prior to 1970

Prior to the late 1960s, statements about higher education, its mission and its characteristics, reflected substantial agreement, and that agreement stands in sharp contrast to conceptions developed later, especially during the 1970s. The sharply defined purpose of higher education was well stated by Millet, who remarked that, "If higher education is to have meaning as a distinct function in our society, it must have some core of purpose which is unique and different from the activities of any other institution, and if higher education is to assert some such purpose, then it must from time to time reassess all of its activities in the light of that central purpose. The common denominator in the work of higher education lies in the concept of intellectual content. Above all other characteristics, higher education requires two qualities in its staff and students. These are individual aptitude and committment to exercise imaginative intelligence. It is not easy to define imaginative intelligence, except to say that it implies the exercise of the highest reaches of the mind. There is at least one other close corollary. This is the open mind, fortified by a basic moral or spirital conviction in the worthof man" (Millett, 1952, p. 11). Russell accepted that notion but implied that though the educational calling was high, there were clear limits to what it might achieve, remarking, "So far as sound general education is concerned, it seems impossible that in a modern democracy we would ever have too many people who were well informed about government, economics, history, literature, music, art, psychology, philosophy, and all the other elements of a sound general and liberal education. The limits of the provision of such instruction are determined more by what the society can afford, than by an apparent ceiling on what it can absorb" (Russell, 1947, p. 12). And there was little doubt among spokemen of that earlier time that higher education was essentially theoretical and abstract, making use of words, numbers, and sophisticated concepts. Faust, after stressing the essentiality of verbal sophistication, argued, "Similar oversimplifications or confusions seem to me to lie in the distinction between education in abstractions or general principles, as against education from experience. A case might be made, I think, that experience is the worst of all teachers; that, indeed, in the absence of understanding through general principles, experience is a great, buzzing confusion. One would not suppose that a student would master chemistry by being turned loose in a chemical laboratory to have as wide a range of unguided experiences as possible. Experence can be directed and rendered intelligible only through generalizations about it. Raw experience is the chaotic succession of impression" (Faust, 1954, pp.2-3). Given such a concept of the essential nature of higher education, there followed general agreement as to what were the requisite traits of college teachers. Harold Taylor caught the essence of that belief when he remarked, "The attitude of a teacher should be primarily that of an intellectual leader who ...should stand before his pupils and before the community at large as the intellectual leader of his time. If the teacher thinks of himself as the intellectual leader of his students, he then finds ways in which the students can respect his opinions, and learn from his range of intellectual experience and from the knowledge which is his personal possesson. I believe it is because the modern teacher often does not conceive his mission as that of an intellectual leader that so much of higher education in the United States is ineffective" (Taylor, 1958, p. 151).

The general agreement as to the nature of higher education was reflected in a series of publications issued during the early 1960s by the United States Office of Education, entitled New Dimensions in Higher Education. Epitomizing the entire series was the bulletin written by Hatch which enunciated a series of standards of quality which really reflected the conventional professional wisdom of the time: "Quality may be indicated in colleges that provide adequate learning resource materials and with students that use them." "Quality may be indicated in colleges whose students do extensive reading and, specifically, a great deal of general reading on their own initiative." "Quality may be indicated in colleges whose students average thirty to forty-five clock hours per week in and out of class studying." "Quality may be indicated in colleges that are most successful in involving their students in independent study." "Quality may be indicated in colleges which, in conjunction with independent study or inquiry, offer common or core curriculums as bases for common understandings." And, "Quality may be indicated in colleges whose introductory courses or programs reflect a discriminating scholarship and also exploit uniqueness, the point being to make them sufficiently above high school courses in method and content to challenge students" (Hatch, 1964).

Those points of view were summarized by Mayhew noting that, "Education was judged to be a rational, intellectual and professional enterprise serving quite specific needs of clients." Further: "College education was judged to be intellectual and conceptual; hence college teaching should deal with intellect and concepts. Comprehension of intellectual and conceptual matters required specific intellectual abilities; hence quality in teaching relied, in considerable measure, in the quality of students" (Mayhew, 1977, pp. 19, 20, 39). A major theme or even quandry is whether those older beliefs retained validity or whether as time changed, the nature and purposes of higher education changed.

Egalitarian Reformers

The validity of that synthesis regarding higher education came under serious attack beginning in the late 1960s, in part as a result of increased heterogeneity of college enrollments, criticisms of higher education implied by the student protest movement, but also by the likelihood, realized first in about 1970, that adherance to the older conception of higher education could very well produce significant drops in enrollment by the end of the 1970s. Numbers of institutions, size of institutions, and numbers of faculty and administration had increased steadily throughout the 1960s, but when those increases appeared threatened by declining birth-rates and prospect for declining enrollment, a different ideology as to what higher education was all about emerged. This new gospel was promulgated by a relatively new breed of professional critic of higher education, who, although academically prepared in one of the traditional disciplinary or professional fields, gained recognition and achievement, not in those fields, but in an emerging role of commentator and critic. Higher educational structure throughout the 1940s and '50s, consisted of a limited number of roles and positions. There were the administrative roles of presidents, vice-presidents, deans, directors, and department heads, together with a few special roles, such as registrar or director of admissions. Then there were the faculty ranks, from instructor to professor, lodged primarily in academic departments. Individuals gained recognition, status, and satisfaction by proceeding through the hierarchies of either administration or faculty. Then, during the 1960s, as higher education began to expand rapidly, a number of developments took place which produced a new generic role of critic or commentator about higher education. First, was the increase in philanthropic and governmental funding, luxurious enough to support full-time critics (frequently in the guise of researchers). Second, was the creation of a variety of roles in colleges or universitities and in educationally-related bureaucracies, whose primary responsibilities, implied studying, thinking about and writing about higher education. Those roles included directors of institutional research, professors of higher education, directors of centers for the improvement of teaching, and staff officers in various educational bureaucracies in charge of projects specifically intended to generate reform, which, of course, by definition, involved criticism of the status quo. Much of the new ideology was developed by incumbents of those new roles who had a vested interest in establishing the failure of earlier doctrine and the need for adoption of whatever reform a particular commentator preferred. The shift as to who was speaking concerning higher education is well illustrated by two sets of proceedings from the annual National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education. The 1953 edition listed 51 contributors as traditional, main-line administrative officers, 15 individuals coming from outside higher education, 10 academic or professional faculty members, and 6 individuals who occupied a new kind of role. In the 1974 edition, 17 contributors represented quite new roles and functions, 7 were main-line, traditional academic administrators, 2 were academic faculty members, and 1 came from outside higher education. One can theorize that spokesmen who are primarily responsible for administering and maintaining an institution are likely to reflect a more prudent view as to how institutions could be improved than would statements of people without those responsibilities.

Although many different kinds of individuals gained visibility as critics and commentators during the 1970s, yet several generalizations about them as a group can be advanced. The first is that they typically had received academic preparation in a traditional discipline or profession, but they were attempting to create new roles for themselves in new kinds of activities. In a sense, they appeared as what sociologists would call "marginal individuals," who, for one reason or another, had left an established reference group of an academic discipline or profession and were seeking to establish a new reference group and reputation. Second, the titles of the positions occupied frequently implied a bias toward certain new kinds of activities; for example, from the 1974 Current Issues in Higher Education there was a mentor in a learning center, a director of planning studies, a coordinator of a student lobby, a director of academic planning, a research educator in a center for research and development, a director of a center for education for research and innovation, a director of courses by newspaper, and a specialist in media programs, a director of an open university, an associate program director for Educational Testing Service, and a project director in a center for research and development in higher education. Without reading a line of what such individuals had written, one could predict what they would likely say and favor.

The ideas elaborated especially by this group of professionalized and potentially institutionalized critics involved a number of elements of earlier reform movements and specific reforms. Gerald Grant and David Riesman classified reforms in higher education from the 1930s onward into two major types. The first they labeled telic reform which embodied significantly different conceptions of the goals and practices of undergraduate education. They saw four major efforts at such significant reform. During the 1930s, neo-classical and aesthetic-expressive kinds of institutions arose. In seeming opposition to the university-college model, St. John's College, with its completely prescribed curriculum based on the hundred "great books of Western Civilization" examplified the neo-classical. Bennington College, Bard College, Sarah Lawrence, and Stephens College, strongly emphasizing the fine and, especially, the performing arts, attempted aesthetic-expressive reform throughout the entire institution. During the 1960s two other telic, reforming kinds of institutions emerged, with the first called communal-expressive, with much of the underlying intellectual base deriving from neo-Freudian psychoanalysis and which stressed in practice great concern for emotion and how emotion could be freed. Johnston College of the University of Redlands, Kresge College at the University of California at Santa Cruz were highly publicized examples. The fourth telic, reforming type of institution,was called the activist radical and was represented by institutions which, as institutions, attempted to deal with the major social issues and malfunctioning of the late twentieth century. Antioch College, Godard College, and, especially, the Staten Island Community College reflected this point of view. At Staten Island Community College, programs were launched for Blacks, former drug addicts, vererans, and, indeed, for anyone who wished to enroll, regardless of previous level of education. Of the four, the last two may have contributed more to the new ideology or doctrine of the late '70s than did the first two, which did stress rigor and standards, either of a verbal sort or of an artistic sort.

The second major category of the reform they labeled as "popular reforms to overcome meritocratic discontents," with these reforms being attempted chiefly during the 1960s. The primary examples of these popular reforms imply discontents, with the first being the reduction of graduation requirements in theory to provide students greater option and greater control over their academic careers. Accompanying the reduction in the requirements came the grade inflation and the developing of alternative grading systems, such as pass/fail, for eliminating the grades of D and F. Deriving out of the same soil of discontent was the adoption across the country of student evaluation of teachers and, eventually, the use of such evaluations for administrative purposes, including promotion and the granting of tenure. Students during that same period of time gained almost complete freedom to live their personal lives as they saw fit, and they also gained the right to participate in various ways in academic governance. The essence of the popular reforms can be epitomized by the words "freedom" and "options," and they crop up repeatedly in the statements of the new critics. These various reforms are thoroughly discussed in (Grant & Riesman, 1978).

The main elements of the newer criticism are revealed in the writings of several individuals holding different points of view, but who, in aggregate, represent a significant drive to change rather completely the historic profile of American higher education. All, in one way or another, adopt a social meliorist position, although how they would facilitate that meliorist goal differs somewhat from individual to individual.

The first group of these critics urge and foresee radical extension of higher education services to more and more segments of the population, and, in effect, see a universal higher education, renamed as "post-secondary education," which would seek to develop whatever traits any individual wished to have developed. One of the more temperate statements of this position is that of Hall, in connection with the discussion of a number of new institutions. He objected to the monolithic ranking system dominating higher education as encouraging all colleges to strive for the same goals of higher quality of faculty, better libraries, and higher academic achievement of students. He contended that his argument was not anti-elitist, but, rather, represented a call for educational pluralism. He essentially contended that each institution should set its own goals and should serve whichever constituency it wished in ways that made sense to those constituencies, and that institutions should be judged not with widely-accepted standards of quality, but by whatever standards each institution believed to be appropriate: "First must come an acceptance of diversity in post-secondary education and the establishment of a variety of standards that recognize this diversity. We need an expanded definition of post-secondary education. One that defines it as more than simple cognitive development. Colleges should be free to set their goals within a broad framework that recognizes the value of cognitive, occupational, and effective development" (Hall and associates, 1974, p. 197). Cross is more radical. She grieves at the fact that eductation has been geared to the development of a narrow range of talent, consisting of approximately one twelfth of known human abiltities, and she argues that educational institutions properly should identify and facilitate development of those remaining eleven twelfths of human talent. To her, "Equal opportunity means more than the opportunity to develop mediocre competence in the area of someone else's strength. Equal opportunity means being provided with the tools to develop one's own talents to the point of excellence" (Cross, 1974, p. 92).

Joseph Katz, another of the highly visible new critics, argues a similar plea for higher education to assume broader responsibilities. He complained, "Higher education seldom gives the student sufficient opportunity to develop the non-intellective parts of his character. The development of a more autonomous identity, of the capacity for intimate communication with other people, and of taking responsibility for others is not brought to the fruitation that most students implicitly desire but cannot realize without further educational development. The college years bring many difficult psychological tasks and problems. Separation from home and parents, confrontation with a wide variety of peers, and high standards of academic performance create insecurities and a questioning of one's powers and identity. Older problems and feelings, often dating back to childhood, are revived once more, and many students find themselves more or less consciously struggling with derivatives of earlier feelings of narcissism, omnipotence, or passive tendency. At the same time, there are the demands of the new roles that the student is about to fill, which call for greater social, sexual, and occupational maturity. The tasks are so staggering that many individuals let some of them go by default; and institutions rarely address themselves in sufficient detail to the problems of helping their students cope with these many-facted problems" (Katz and associates, 1968, p. 4).

Another major preoccupation of the new critics is with what is called experiential learning -- the awarding of academic credit for experiences outside formal institutional and classroom settings. One of the more prudent and temperate arguments to support experiental learning contends that,

one can think of six groups of people for whom some version of experiental learning might therefore provide an opportunity to learn things not learned and to learn things well that might otherwise be learned poorly; all those who succeed relatively well in school by traditional criteria, those who fail, relatively speaking, those who drop out early for one reason or another, those who are bored even if successful, those who are not in school but want to continue growing, and those who are not now in school but want to return. In short, virtually everyone.

Typical of reforming statements is an appeal to major social or philosophic currents in the society with respect to assigning academic credit for life experience. A typical statement reads, "Pressing philosophical and practical reasons require American colleges and universities to become involved with the process of crediting prior learning, that is, those non-academic life or work experiences which students have acquired before formal contact with the institution and for which they desire recognition in the form of credits for degrees." With unusual candor the author of that statement goes on and argues some ". . . .obvious reasons for accrediting previous learning is that we are serving different students. Colleges and universities are seriously courting the adult student. In part, their action is the logical outcome of accepting the philosophy of life-long learning. A more powerful cause is the rather startling realization that enrollment of the normal college-age student will decline (Meyer, 1975, p.6).

Another theme which appears time and time again is that there have been profound changes in society and equally profound changes in life-patterns of individuals, and that formal higher education should conform itself to such changes. Such changes would be: increased longevity of Americans, earlier physical maturation of youth, decreasing time spent at work, and changing family structures. Boyer is reasonably typical of those who argue for education to adapt, saying, "For years, we have just assumed that life for all of us was neatly programmed. There were the early days of freedom; then came formal education, after that, work; then abrupt decline. And we quite properly built colleges and universities to fit this rigid cycle, serving principally the young and unattached. Now with the birth-rate falling off, we are inclined to panic; we fear a new depression as we lose our natural clientele."

"But it seems clear that the old life-patterns are beginning to break up and that there is another way to view the present scene....Even though the baby-boom has slackened, there are still more people to be served. Mid-career people have more leisure time, and they face the crisis of early obsolescence. Older people retire earlier, live longer, have more free time, and are often socially unattached. Now we have blocks of freedom throughout all of life, and for the first time in our history higher eeducation may be viewed not only as a pre-work tradition but as a process to be pursued from eighteen to eighty-five" (Boyer, 1974, p. 7).

As the newer critics relfect on such changes they frequently advance suggestions for new structural arrangements (often without attending to the financial, social, political, or even ethical implications). Thus, one proposed an educational passport which would contain a record of all a student's educational and presumed educational experience. When a student wished to enroll in an educational program, he would simply present the passport for immediate evaluation, thus eliminating the rather laborious conventional process. Another would create regional examining institutes, which would blanket the country and which, through a variety of testing procedures, would validate experience and presumably legitimate awarding of academic credit. Still another urges nation-wide or region-wide networks of educational and other institutions through which highly complex new learning configurations can emerge. Such networks are portrayed in a utopian mode: "Let us imagine that ours is going to become, and ought to become, a learning society, in the sense that practically all citizens will need to continue learning throughout their lives. Let us imagine that much of this learning will be playful, since many will have come to enjoy learning and to be curious about many things. Much of the learning, we will imagine, will also be useful for understanding and acting on issues of public policy and personal choice. Still other learning will be directly useful in people's work and in sustaining or enhancing their competence for economically productive or rewarding work throughout life.

"Let us hope, but not be too sanguine in expecting, that a growing proportion of this learning will be self-directed. The learner's own vocational interest, his citizen concerns, his personal hobbies, and his priorities in other respects will activate his inquiries and direct his calls upon the retrieval capabilities of our systems for meeting his learning needs. An enormous problem will then arise, and the full capacity of all the possible networks will be required to cope with this problem: how can we best help this learner -- and a multitude of others -- find, understand, interpret, and apply what they need from the over-abundance of stored intellectual treasure" (Keeton, 1974, p. 104). Still another, using the analogy of the existing interacting system of airline reservations suggests a national counseling and advising system. Wilson suggests we " . . .examine, then, the feasibility of establishing a national system of educational brokers who have been trained to serve potential students for post-secondary education, and who have at their fingertips current and accurate information on all the post-secondary educational opportunities for which a given client might qualify. Such a system would place a skilled counselor and his information devices in every village, town, and metropolitan subdivision, perhaps in the local library. These counselors would also make use of such existing channels as county extension offices, vocational rehabilitation services, and public welfare and employment agencies.

"These public post-secondary educational counselors would be united by an elaborate data-processing and information retrieval system, one aspect of which would be similar to that used by airlines, who confirm instantly the availability of space. Counselors would be prepared to administer diagnostic and competency tests to help clients more clearly define their educational needs and vocational aspirations" (Wilson, 1974, p. 110).

Still another pervasive theme is to pick out some particularly visible and dramatic presumed social disorder and then to suggest, frequently with dramatic prose, how education can solve that particular problem. Bailey, in much of his writing, was addicted to such rhetoric, as, for example: "Television addiction and other passive forms of recreation among the young appear to have other undesirable effects. These passive pursuits have been cited as possible contributers to the startling decrease in both verbal and mathematical skills, as measured by national testing agencies. Careful students of the influence of television on the American culture are beginning to identify even more unhappy consequences: a shortening of viewer's attention span; a debasing of social and cultural values, to the extent that sensitivity to even violence and love are narcotized; a propensity to respond to the stimuli of the moment; a false sense of the possibilities of democracy; and a concommitant disenchantment with the political process. Surely the educational system can help people have more creative engagements with the world than are offered by television. . . .the educational system knows far more about the pursuit of happiness than is generally understood. An examination of our human inheritance reveals that lasting inner satisfaction comes from four sources: creating and appreciating beauty, enhancing physical well-being, performing obligations of service, and intensifying intellectual and emotional discovery. Education at its best can lead to each one of these satisfactions" (Bailey, 1976, pp. 40,41). Schumacher argues the same omnisicent potential power of higher education, claiming " . . . there are three things healthy people most need to do, and education ought to prepare them for these: first, to act as spiritual beings -- that is to say, to act in accordance with their moral impulses; second, to act as neighbors -- that is to say, to render service to their fellows; and, third, to act as persons, as autonomous centers of power and responsibility -- that is to say, to be creatively engaged, using and developing the gifts that have been laid into them. These are the human being's three fundamental needs, and in their fulfillment lies happiness. In their unfulfillment lies frustration and unhappiness" (Schumacher, 1977, pp. 59-60).

These brief quotes (are indicative) of several themes in the litany of reform. Much more persuasive that there appears to be a declining explicit concern with educational and intellectual quality in higher education are the essays regarding the future written by twenty-six out of the forty-four individuals indentified by Change magazine as having the greatest influence on American higher education. Those predictions dealt with many matters, but almost never with the term or concept of educational quality. The major themes of those essays were: a concern with life-long learning; a continuing quest for equality of opportunity (but without dealing with the perplexing matter of maintaining quality at the same time); the likelihood of increasing governmental intervention in college and university affairs; and a weak fourth theme involved the potentiality of educational uses of technology. It is true that David Riesman deplored the threat to major liberal arts colleges and private research universities: " ...caught between the inflationary rise of costs and expectations and the inability in a populist democracy to select and support a few centers of excellence as the seed-corn of high culture" (Riesman, 1977, p. 30). It is further true that John R. Silber satirized the possible end-result of egalitarianism, pointing out, "True egalitarianism, which taught that there must be not only equality of access to higher education, but also equality of result, developed rapidly after 1976. Behavioral objectives and competence-based programs were instrumental in this development: once that it was decided that the time that it took to learn something was irrelevant to learning, it was possible for medical students who took five years to master organic chemistry not only to practice alonside their faster colleagues, but also to buy the same no-fault malpractice insurance. By century's end, a movement arose to rid higher education of its speciesism -- its exclusive preoccupation with the education of human beings. The Department of General Welfare ruled that the fact that a dog took ten weeks to learn to shake hands (one of the basic requirements for a doctorate under reforms introduced in 1984) must not be held against it. The important thing, GW argued, was the dog's eventual competence" (Silber, 1977, p. 195). And Clark Kerr did, after first having fun with the failures of other predictions, express a faith in needs which implied a clear concern with quality. Observing, "...the certainty that higher education will be more needed in the future than in the past as a supplier of ever more advanced skills, as a source of ever more complex new ideas, as an entry to an ever more desired higher quality of life for individuals, as a supplier of ever more needed social commentary, as a basis for social reform, and as a preserver and enhancer of the ever more expanding cultural heritage" (Kerr, 1977, p. 42). The remaining writers either ignored quality or expressed some variant of what can be considered a new anti-intellectualism. Thus, Arthur Cohen predicted with considerable approbation the growing use of part-time, non-professional professors who will hold other jobs and who will teach quite specific matters to equally otherwise preoccupied part-time students (Cohen, 1977, p. 57). Edmund A. Glazer, Jr., also predicted a kind of de-professionalization of higher education through relying on community colleges, community schools, departments of recreation and parks, health agencies, libraries, labor unions, and volunteer organizations all to be cooperating in rendering higher educational service -- service extremely broadly construed (Glazer, 1977, p. 133). Morris Keeton, more exhortative than predictive, inveighed against existing educational standards, arguing that what passed for good practice and high standards was "...class-biased, ethnically biased, sex-biased, color biased, by the biases of professionalism in both the disciplines and the professions, poorly coordinated with employer's needs, and anachronistic in light of our knowledge of pedagogy and human development needs" (Keeton, 1977, pp. 179-180).

Several years after the original poll concerning leadership, Change magazine sought to establish who were the upcoming leaders of higher education. It finally selected a hundred, each of whom was asked to discuss coming challenges for higher education. Four major themes emerged: fear of growing government intervention and red tape and fear of increased use of quantification in making decisions; hope that the university might again become a moral force in community affairs; and hope that vocational and life-long education might be extended to every citizen. Virtually none addressed the matter of quality, nor suggested even that perhaps ways should be discovered to maintain it. About the closest the group came was to express hope that both the traditional liberal arts and sciences and the newer non-traditional subjects might be maintained and expanded, although not going into how that might be done.

It is difficult to gauge the impact the new reformers have had or might have on the course of higher education since they became prominent only in about 1970. They are clearly an articulate group of individuals who have written a great deal. Of a group of critics writing in the 1950s who were frequently quoted and who appeared regularly on conference circuits, only one out of twenty-six identified as central could be classified as supporting what came to be the new ideology. Out of the twenty-four comparable writers of the late 1970s, thirteen were of this newer pursuasion. (The two lists of writers are included on page 75). That group of thirteen out of the twenty-four has been particularly active on the conference circuit and participating in a variety of summer workshops which produce proceedings intended to stimulate faculties and institutions to significant reform. Time has allowed judgment of the impact of at least a few of the earlier writers who stressed the historic values of thought, knowledge, rationality and disciplines. McGrath clearly left an imprint on the concept of liberal education which can be seen in liberal arts colleges throughout the country. Williamson helped define the intellectual base for providing student services as an aid to intellectual and academic development. Metzger, and Hook came closer than any other scholars in providing an intellectual definition of academic freedom. 1982 is still too early to determine the lasting quality of Katz's belief that the total personality should be of collegiate concern, of Newman's plea for many new types of institutions, or of Keeton's belief that most non-malignant experience deserves academic credit.

As of 1982, the ideas of the new reformers appear to be most frequently accepted in the public-supported two-year junior colleges, the private invisible liberal arts colleges in financial difficulty, and in a number of new, tuition-driven institutions created during the 1970s. Here and there, in some of the middle-level, comprehensive colleges and universities, a few parts of the new doctrine are attempted, as, for example Gonzaga University entering into the part-time doctoral work sort of activity. But the names of the prestige private colleges and universities and flagship state universities virtually never appear in the lists of institutions participating in programs for radical reform.

The reformers of the 1970s and early 1980s appear typically to have embraced a set of beliefs which can be seriously questioned on both theoretical and empirical grounds. The first of these is the emphasis placed on the great importance of education among social institutions. There is implicit acceptance, and in some statements explicit acceptance, of the belief that higher education is the pivotal institution in society, and that if only the problems of education can be solved, it will inform and improve by leaps the quality and tone of all American life. Actually, a case can be made that higher education has historically been important in American society, but never of preeminent importance. The eight colonial colleges added something to colonial society, but the major institutional contributions were made by the church, the market-place, the nuclear family, the small town, and, especially, the existance of a frontier. In the late nineteenth century, colleges, land-grant colleges, and the newly created private universities were beginning to have some influence on America as civilization, but this was modest as contrasted, again, with the church, eighty-acre family farms, village life, the growing cities, the growing market-place, railroads, and the military (largely through the impact of the one tremendous convulsion of the 1860s). And even in the last half of the twentieth century, when higher education gained its greatest visibility, fianancial support, and attention, a case can be made for the even greater formative impact of other competing social institutions which would include the corporation, the military, the labor union, the factory, and even the non-academic intellectual community. To argue the case rhetorically, consider the case of the 65 year-old living in 1982 who was reared in a white, suburban community within three blocks of his church, his elementary school, his high school, and the principle shopping area, who experienced the Depression decade, who attended a public university, who participated in five years of military service during World War II, who obtained a Ph.D., and was married for forty-two of those sixty-five years, and who also taught in colleges and universities. It would be difficult to argue the supremacy of formal education over those other powerful institutionalized influences of community, family, and the military.

Related to the error of over-drawing the importance of higher education is the error of so expanding activities deemed appropriate as to make meaningless any definition of higher education which could inform and direct educational decisions. When whatever changes human behavior in anyone over eighteen years of age is judged appropriate activities for higher education and worthy of academic credit, the problem of establishing priorities, allocating resources, and making decisions becomes essentially capricious or political. The preceding statement is not a caricature but paraphrases reasonably well the broad assignment of responsibility to a collegiate educational institution as is revealed by Gollattscheck and others: "The community renewal college offers a new model of education, one that is committed to the needs of society and dedicated to renewal in all its forms: human renewal for all our people; urban renewal of our cities and neighborhoods; environmental renewal of the greater communities we serve; political renewal, so critical in a republic based on the concept of rule by the people; and even perhaps the moral and spiritual renewal of a great nation" (Gollattscheck, 1976, p. 12).

Such a statement reveals a fearsome immodesty and would on the base of it urge the college as legitimate educational activities to engage in political action, social work, and even evangelism. In addition, the earlier claims that elementary and secondary education could reform society proved to be specious.

A third associated error is the assumption of infinitely available financing to enable collegiate institutions to do those many things. Frequently using the analogue that so long as Americans spend more for alcohol and tobacco than for education, there will always be, or always should be, available funding to support whatever services collegiate institutions decide to provide as they respond to presumed needs. Occasionally writers advocating such expanded services raise the financial issue, but the majority do not. They assume infinite financial resources although a more likely scenario during the last fifth of the twentieth century would be for higher education to receive a decreasing percentage of the gross national product, thus forcing through financial means, priorities to be established and decisions reached.

An underpinning for the assumption of continuously expanding financing is the use of real, or potential, or presumed, human need as full justification for institutional efforts to satisfy that need. A case could be made that children need to learn about sex, that people need to learn to participate in community organizations, that retired people need stimulation, that working mothers need assistance in caring for their children, that homemakers need information upon which to base wise consumer spending, that many people have long postponed desire for a college diploma, or that incarcerated criminals need help in preparing for the time they leave prison. To argue, however, that the existance of those needs is justification for the educational institution to attempt to satisy them seems patently absurd. Somehow, some responsibility and satisfaction might be left to individuals or to other relevant social institutions.

This generally expansionist posture leads inexorably to a further error, which involves those who will deliver the needed services. On the one hand, this leads the reformers to argue that professors, trained to do one thing, should willingly submit to training to do many other things and be willing to do them. In Chapter V, it will be noted that people who become professors early developed an interest in some subject and that, over time, involvement with that subject became one of the essential elements of their lives. To expect such an indivudual happily to foresake that interest is to attribute superhuman powers to human beings. Of course, the other side of this matter is to reject the professionally prepared professor or instructor, and to replace them with people from many different walks of life, expecting them also to cultivate quite new skills, interests, and motivations in return for love, satisfaction, or money. In a sense, this expectation would have the professor become a therapist and the therapist become a professor, with all of the consequences such a profound change implies.

A last error is of a different sort, and that is the tendency for the reformers to resort to hyperbole to criticize the grevious shortcomings of education and to proclaim the possibilities of paradise to come through embracing the new. Thus, education is judged to have failed miserably to prepare people for change, to have failed to renew cities, or to have inculcated rigid ways of thinking on the part of those who proceeded through its processes. Then, "revolutionary" changes should be made, the particular "revolutionary" change being whatever the preoccupation is of the commentator, such as community education, community renewal, life-long learning, or competency-based education. It is fortunate that there are commentators using less dramatic language and making thoughtful analyses, rather than grandiose claims. It is to be hoped that those more prudent critics will, in the long run, prevail. However, the sheer din of the more extreme language may have its effect: A revolution is underway in the United States -- a revolution very different from other revolutions this country has experienced and certainly unlike those that other countries have undergone. I predict that once we have reached our goal of education for all, we will turn our attention to providing education for each. Higher education faces a profound crisis of purpose.

The danger of these beliefs are several. Elaborate claims as to the primacy and potency of higher education to influence positively all aspects of American life can and likely will lead to frustration, disillusionment, and eventually a weakening in public regard for education as did the elaborate claims that the public school system would lead to a better life for all, contribute to the disrepute into which public education had fallen by the 1970s. When the result of claims of public school omnipotence turns out to be functional illiteracy numbered in the millions, public disregard was bound to follow. Similarly, when virtually every kind of life activity is judged worthy of academic credit the entire national system of imposing standards on the preparation of those performing critical tasks for society is undermined without demonstration that those standards were essentially invalid. It might, of course, be established that knowledge taught in college courses in mathematics, chemistry, biology, physiology, and physics (typically required in pre-medical curriculum) is irrelevant to eventually successful performance as a doctor; there is a logic however, which suggests a connection between organic and inorganic chemistry, pharmacology, and the making of prescriptions in the treatment of disease. Such a logic is absent from the clearly implied beliefs of many reforming statements that the undergraduate credits awarded for such things as military service or successful avocational experiences should be counted as important parts of an undergraduate degree on the basis of which individuals can apply for admissions into medical school. And the conflicting contentions that anyone who can do something can appropriately teach college classes, and that individuals trained to teach something can and should perform a wide variety of other helping services, leads to considerable confusion as to what the public can rightfully expect from collegiate programs.

Even the rhetoric of reformers can generate false expectations as to the capabilities of educational institutions and practices. When people are told that the task of conveying information in the academic disciplines has become untenable as a teaching function and that academic information as the backbone of education is obsolete, they are led to suspect the one thing which colleges and universities has contributed to Western civilization.

As of 1982, the ideas of the new reformers do not appear to have penetrated the major reseach universities and substantial numbers of comprehensive colleges and liberal arts colleges. They do find expression in publicly supported community colleges and a majority of the newer kinds of institutions created since about 1968 attempting to serve new categories of students. Were that condition to remain, there perhaps would be no reason for serious concern since the preparation of people to enter into the professions, vocations and callings of some intellectual significance would be reasonably well understood. The danger is that the overly simplified concepts of the reforming literature tempts weaker institutions to experiment without a requisite critical mass of informed faculty. The reforming rhetoric is such that close to marginal institutions repeatedly use that rhetoric to justify, what to objective observers would seem to be close to criminal. The self-study report of one Southern California institution, now out of business, was filled with glowing examples of how it was putting into effect the ideas of not only reformers, but some of a group of more prudent critics. By every qualitative standard imaginable that institution was essentially an exploitation of the Black community it purported to help. A further danger is that the sheer volumne of reform rhetoric could lead to widespread misunderstanding of what was actually taking place in the majority of established collegiate institutions. There was a time when the annual national conference on higher education, sponsored by the then Association for Higher Education, reflected in its panels, speeches and seminars the major developments in all of higher education. That conference rightfully was the single place to go to obtain a balanced overview as to what was taking place in America's collegiate institutions. However, during the 1970s, the conference began to concentrate on innovations and began to feature the more visible reformers and began to ignore the principle activities taking place in long established and well regarded colleges and universities.

In many respects, the best reactions of institutions to the reforming doctrine and its fundamental errors would be benign neglect. The rationale would be that if individuals, or, indeed, the citizens of the several states, wished to pay for a wide range of activities carried on by people variously trained and experienced and call what is done higher education or post-secondary education, that is a right in a free society. The pace-setting colleges and universities, and those other institutions seeking to emulate them, will very likely continue to perform as they historically have and to pay little attention to the rhetoric of the reformers. Such institutions might even serve as sanctuary to some of the recommended instrumentalities of reform, such as centers for the improvement of instruction, and which conceivably might be useful for a few people, but without seriously deflecting the force of established and traditional practice. However, there are some consequences of such neglect which at least ought to be explored. The most serious of such consequences lies in misleading people participating in new kinds of educational activities that they are indeed receiving elements of or, indeed, a full college education. It is misleading to offer academic credit for remedial reading courses, informing students that such work can be applied as electives to an associate's or bachelor's degree program. It is also misleading to award bachelor's degrees largely on the basis on life experiences and imply to recipients that, should they desire, they are fully prepared and qualified to enter graduate or professional programs in traditional universities. It is also misleading to imply to external doctoral degree programs that a course in statistics and research design taught once a month for three months by a competent individual will prepare that student to do graduate-level, sophisticated research. Here, a matter of nomenclature is important. It would not be misleading to award certificates or even diplomas for any of the wide variety of activities urged by reformers. Further, it would not be misleading to create new names for newer graduate non-traditional programs which clearly describe what they actually do. Thus, an external graduate program in educational administration might lead legitimately to a degree of diplomate in educational administration, whereas it would be misleading to award the Ph.D. for the typical intermittant experiences which comprise the external degree activity.

A second consequence, particularly for publically-supported institutions, but also including privately-supported institutions whose students receive tax-provided fianancial support, is the matter of fundamental public finance policy. Of course, the American public, through its elected representatives tax itself to support virtually any kind of activity, not precluded by the Federal Constitution or the constitutions of the several states. However, as has been repeatedly stressed, government involves itself in education in pursuit of community-wide, state-wide, or nation-wide concerns and objectives. The federal government has clearly reflected such a concept through its categorical grants to produce doctors, basic research, and agriculturalists. States similarly have created colleges to prepare teachers and have created universities because states needed doctors, lawyers, social workers, engineers, and businessmen. But, in the face of clearly limited resources, one can question using public money to train individuals to repair their own cars, to offer language refresher courses for individuals desiring to travel abroad, to provide draft counseling to eighteen-year-old males, or to offer courses in current events -- labeling all of these higher education. As has been stressed repeatedly, life is full of commendable human needs, but there conceivably might be a limit to what needs the public should be expected to support, and especially to support through the instrument of collegiate education, intended originally for quite definite and limited purposes. An interesting policy dilemma was raised by the Commission on Non-Traditional Learning, which pointed out the large number of Americans participating in learning actitivies outside the recognized educational system. Then, the Commission reaches a peculiar policy recommendation, by noting favorably, an individual claiming ". . .that we will need to revise our thinking and priorities to include the periphery when considering public policy decisions affecting resource allocation" (Cross, 1972, p. 41). Without questioning the intrinsic value of a publicly-supported life-skills curriculum, which offered courses on "developing one's self and relating to others," "managing a career," "managing home and family responsibilities," "managing leisure time," "exercising community rights," and "opportunities and responsibilities," one must still be permitted the nagging question as to the legitimacy of using public funds for such activities, especially when lack of public funding might, in some way, be related to the deepening failures of public school systems.

As a prologue to an agenda for restoration and maintaining of educational quality in higher education, there should be extended serious public discussion of higher educational priorities and costs. In an honest debate, those who argue or imply that public support underwrite the 82,000,000 Americans estimated in engaging in some form of formal adult education should be asked to indicate at what costs and at the expense of what other public services. One of the most infuriating elements of the reform literature is the tendency to stress the magnitude of the population who could be served, but without discussing seriously the financial, pedagogical, or even political consequences of any realistic effort to convert extreme ideas into reality.

The principle elements of an agenda for restoration of a concern for quality were alluded to in Chapter I and will also be allued to or elaborated in subsequent chapters. The first and most important agenda item would be a parsimonious view as to what higher education is and what professors and higher educational institutions can really do. If a parsimonious view were adopted, nationally there could be sharper focus for allocation of resources, and institutions could better decide what to emphasize at the instititional level. The new reforming doctrine as has been repeatedly stressed, takes a limitless view as to what colleges and universities should undertake using as the primary criterion for doing so the existence of human need and demand. That doctrine leads institutions into offering programs regardless of whether or not they have the requisite knowledge, personnel and sophistication to do so honestly and effectively. Land grant institutions honestly and effectively served the agricultural interests of the various states because they combined the research generated by experimental stations with the sophisticated insights of faculties in schools of agriculture to form a solid base upon which to conduct the work of county agricultural agents, short courses and Four-H Club leaders. In a sense, agricultural education could serve as a model as to what collegiate institutions should and should not do. It offers education deriving from a complex and sophisticated base of research and scholarship interpreted by a critical mass of faculty, monitored and organized by administrators deeply versed in the problems and issues of agriculture. In Chapter III some criteria will be advanced as to what is and is not appropriate for collegiate curriculum. The spirit of what is being urged hereis well expressed by Barzun commenting on the errors of overly expanding collegiate based activities. He pointed out that colleges and universities could have taken a more intellectually healthy route by adopting ". . .simplier ways, intellectually sounder and more in keeping with (available resources). Simplicity would have meant not just giving up grants and foundation playthings such as institutes and centers for immediate social action, but also many ornamental activities, including public sports. Some of us who urged the move at the time were ridiculed as "scholastic - monastic." But I accept the phrase as tersely descriptive of a still desirable correction."Monastic" here has of course nothing to do with religion or aceticism or the model of co-education and co-habitation now a part of campus life. It betokens merely the mind concentrated on study in a setting without frills. To rediscover its true purpose is always in order for an institution or any other being, and doing so entails scraping away all pointless accretions is always a painful act, but it is least painful after a catastrophe such as happened in 1965-1968.

The new directions would have had to be taken by several institutions in concert. They would have been criticized and misrepresented and denounced in the ordinary heedless way. They might even have suffered a few lean years; but with reduced tuitions and a shorter, clearer and solider curriculum; with enhanced teaching and voluntary scholarship (as opposed to the publish or perish genre); with increased accessibility to the gifted poor, they would soon have earned respect and a following - the following of the best, by natural self-selection; after which public support and money would have flowed to them by sheer economic preference" (Barzun, 1981, p. 35).

A second agenda item would be the adoption by administrators, professors, critics and reformers, legislators and, indeed, the entire society of a stoical view that human beings and human institutions are fundamentally resistant to radical change, and that efforts to do well prove, for the most part, unavailing. Lecturing went on constantly in medieval universities and lecturing went on constantly in American higher education in the last decades of the twentieth century. Medieval education was essentially verbal and so has been American higher education. The stoic ideal stressed the intractability of the human condition, but also stressed the obligation of individuals to modify it, being tranquil from the effort, accepting the fact that it will likely not produce dramatic results. This ideal suggests that the conscientious professional administrator or professor probably should seek to improve the curriculum while recognizing that such effort will really not change much. A wise president or dean would encourage serious faculty discussion, but would refrain from predicting heroic reforms. A rather good case can be made that the traits most needed for professional workers in institutionalized higher education would be, first, the stoic sense of duty; second, a ribald sense of humor; and, third, a sympathy for the absurd. Stoicism seems essential to manage what Cohen and March have called organized anarchy, a sense of humor is needed to tolerate the pompousness and self-aggradizement on the part of academic man, and a sympathy for the absurd allows toleration for endless academic debate on matters of virtually no consequence, as, for example, whether a semester or a quarter system is best.

The third agenda item would consist of serious re-examination of educational tradition, to determine whether it was as bad and as irrelevant as the reformers have suggested. In this connection, it is quite likely that the principle reason why significant, pervasive reforms have not taken place in the major four-year established institutions is that traditional styles and techniques have a validity perceived by people which is not shared by many of the radical critics. The traditions most frequently criticized with respect to undergraduate education are a four-year degree program measuring academic credit by hours spent in class, formal courses meeting regularly each week, lecturing, letter grades for academic subjects, organizing courses intended for eighteen-to twenty-two-year olds, and admission to college on the basis of demonstrated academic performance and measured academic aptitude. In aggregate, these elements are viewed as academic lock-step, to be avoided at all costs. Yet the same elements can be judged positively as providing the needed structure, intensity of experience, routine, and as dividing complicated intellectual tasks into manageable units. The Monday, Wednesday, Friday class meeting one hour each day, for each of which two hours of preparation is assumed functions reasonably well, whereas a much more intense experience (a seven-week single course plan) or a much more casual plan of classes meeting but occasionally tended to leave students intellectually and emotionally exhausted or frustrated because of lack of graduated evidence of progress. While all educational practice should be periodically assessed, that assessment should not start from the premise that the practices are likely to be found wanting. Rather, the opposite premise might well be employed. Thus, disciplinary courses have persisted, while interdisciplinary courses have difficulty surviving because both faculty and students feel comfortable in the comfort of disciplinary structure. Courses stress transmission and elaboration of information, because that is what professors can best do and is what students fundamentally wish and expect, and many faculty and students do not relate intensively to each other on a personal level, in part because they represent two distinct generations, which, while having something in common, are also unique and would not expect to spend a great amount of time together. Probably the three hours of formal class, coupled with an occasional conference between a faculty member and an individual seeking specific help could very well be viewed as the optimum personal contact between a faculty member and students. Faculty members obviously should not be encouraged to hate students, neither should they be expected to love them individually or collectively. It is intriguing that many of the reformers would probably not wish deep personal involvement between themselves and the professionals who serve them -- physicians, lawyers, clergymen, and tax accountants -- yet urge professors to become deeply involved with their students' total lives. Actually, the middle-aged professor who spends great amounts of time with students outside of class -- who regularly entertains them in his or her home, who joins their clubs, and who seeks their company in preference to the company of colleagues - might well be regarded with suspicion, on the ground that such behavior exhibited a need for love which could jeopardize rendering of professional service.

Especially is needed a calmer educational rhetoric and a more rational marshalling and presenting of evidence or indicating the lack of relevant evidence. Not much clarity is produced, for example, by Boyer noting that, "Historically, the span of human life has been chopped up into slices like a great salami, with each section having a special flavor all its own. First, there was the thin slice of early childhood -- the time of happy play. Then came the thicker slice -- twelve to twenty years, perhaps -- devoted almost exclusively to full-time study. Next, we had the still thicker chunk of full-time work. And, finally, came retirement -- the little nubbin at the end -- characterized by some as dignified decline" (Boyer, 1974, p. 5). Actually, from the Bible on to the most contemporary social psychologists we are informed of the validity of different seasons in man's life and the differing needs and imperatives of those seasons. It simply is not true that collegiate institutions have failed to prepare people to cope with dramatically changing life conditions, as is so frequently suggested by the radical reformers. The relatively traditional and structured higher education of the 1920s and '30s obviously did not disqualify graduates from coping with the worldwide economic depression, a world war, and an unexpected period of growth and affluence after the war. It is not just true that formal, organized, and credentialed education stifles human growth and creativity, and that those traits may be most successfully cultivated and cherished in a romantic setting of complete freedom. Certainly structure can become oppressive and routine deadening, but that does not establish the invalidity of structure or routine. No productive research group could expect to uncover brilliant insights without careful preparation and meticulous attention paid routinely to detail.

A fifth agenda item is simply to urge acceptance of the extreme slowness of significant educational change. In the life of the young, a single lecture, a single course, or a single experience will likely produce no perceptible change in behavior, attitude, or perspective. However, over time, continuous and related lectures, courses, and experiences produce significant changes in individuals. Education is not unlike the dripping of water on a granite stone. A single drip produces no change, but years of continuous dripping can alter radically the character of a mountain. If this point has validity, it would call into question glorifying the potential value of brief, academic experience for community junior college students. The community junior college doctrine argues that some students want, need and use two weeks of college work, whereas others want, need, and can use much deeper exposure, and that the high attrition rate of community colleges should be praised, rather than criticized, on the ground that those who drop out after six weeks, a semester, or a year have, very likely, profited from that exposure. The point should also call into question programs which assume brief educational exposures extending over years, as being of equal value to the shorter, more intensive, but still continual exposure of courses, instruction, and experience during a four year period. One college course a semester extending over fifteen to twenty years, is not likely to produce significant change in behavior, whereas the concentrated exposure to experiences in a full-time baccalaureate program over four years would seem to have a much greater chance of producing significant outcomes. Similarly, a concentrated graduate program, in which students continuously, day by day and year by year, interact with each other regarding substantive matters appears to be a plausible way of producing insightful scholars. Extending a graduate program over ten or fifteen years of a class meeting every Saturday, coupled with occasional status consultations with an advisor would seem to be implausible with respect to any change other than the cosmetic one of acquiring a credential.

In many respects most of the principle ideas suggested by the new reform have been embraced by institutions primarily because of financial considerations which seemed to transcend considerations of intellectual and academic quality. Catering to new kinds of students is adopted because it yields income to replace losses due to declining enrollments of college-age youth. Public community colleges extend new and varied services not only to their own communities, but to far distant communities, including those located over seas because that generates enrollment which in turn generates income. Part-time and adjunct faculty increasingly used in large part because they cost less than full-time faculty members whose compensation must include benefits and payment for a variety of services to the institution. Expanded individual study is stressed because at the time it generates tuition income, it does not require the expensive face-to-face contact between student and faculty member offering degree programs. Further, individual study actually requires only one year of academic work, and it is used as a means of generating one years tuition paid by students who could not possibly pay for a four year program. Thus, a one year tuition is better than no tuition. In California, unified school districts developed elaborate programs of adult education because state financing made it possible for the districts. Then financing arrangements were modified so that the state did not underwrite full costs, but rather marginal costs. Unified school districts quickly dismantled their providing services to all adults. If in some way institutional profit could be taken out of newly developed services it seems likely that those services would quickly be discontinued.

Authors on Higher Education

Active in the 1950s

Jacques Barzun
Howard Bowen
John Millett
Earl McGrath
David Riesman
Paul L. Dressel
Russell Cooper
Sydney French
Theodore Hesburgh
G. Kerry Smith
Frank Bowles
C. Robert Pace
Clark Kerr
Harold Taylor
Sidney Hook
Paul Woodring
Nevitt Sanford
E. G. Williamson
M.M. Chambers
T. R. McConnell
Leland Melsker*
Edmund Glaezer*

Active in the 1970s

K. Patricia Cross*
Ernest Boyer*
Morris Keeton*
W. Victor Baldridge
Patrick Callan*
J. Douglas Brown
Russell Edgerton*
Frank Newman*
Alexander Astin
William Birnbaumet
Kenneth Eble
J. B. Lou Hefferlin
John Roueche*
Harold Hodgkinson*
Richard Meeth
Joseph Katz*
Arthur Levine
Burton R. Clark
Allan Cartter
Arthur Chickering*
Douglas Heath*
Daniel Bell

*Egalitarian Reformers

Chapter III

Undergraduate Curriculum

Despite many examples of curricular shoddiness and failure, the undergraduate curriculum in United States colleges and universities reached two peaks during the decades which followed World War II. During those decades there were examples of meaningless requirements, dull, pedestrian teaching, and patterns of courses producing virtually no impact on students. Nonetheless, at the height of each of the two peaks there was, among faculty and students, a generalized agreement as to what curriculur quality was and was not.

Curricular Quality

Curricular quality is a bit like Associate Justice Powell's remark about pornography -- he couldn't define it, but he certainly recognized it when he saw it. The underlying premise of regional accreditation, site visits and program review is that experienced academics can, by examining catalogs, visiting classes, and talking with students and faculty, judge whether or not a program is of high or low quality. There does exist a norm of academic quality which is implied by standardized tests, research regarding the impact of college, and in the rhetoric used to discuss curricular matters.

That norm is found in the conception of the undergraduate curriculum as being intended to assist the young, through the uses of words, numbers, and abstract concepts, to understand, cope with, and eventually control the environment in which people find themselves. Another way of expressing that norm would be through statements of fundamental purpose of the undergraduate college. It is custodial in that it is an appropriate place for the young until adult society is ready to receive them. It is intended as a screen which, through a variety of hurdles, selects people for advanced training or for positions of responsibility in adult society. Collegiate education serves as a conduit for talent and strongly influences subsequent occupation. Third undergraduate education is intended to provide the young with the idiom, metaphor, allusion, and rhetoric needed for a common universe of discourse. While undergraduate education does not prepare directly for many vocations, it can and does prepare directly for immediate entry into a few vocations. such as teaching, engineering, nursing, or accounting. Lastly, undergraduate education can be conceived of as a period during the development of late adolescence when individuals can react to a variety of influences as they develop a coherent sense of their own identity. Such a conception, through concentrating on post-adolescent youth and intellect, might seem to ignore such valid human needs as self improvement for adults, learning basic English on the part of foreign-born, or the acquisition of technical skills needed for a wide variety of vocations. Those may deserve attention in institutional ways; yet, to include them as essential components of undergraduate programs is so to confuse educational purpose as to produce dissipation of educational effort. Asking the same faculty to offer or even to oversee such disparate programs as traditional baccalaureate programs, remedial work, avocational training, working with prison inmates in preparation for successful release, or to offer programs for the aging, is to expect too much -- witness the continuing identity crisis which affects public two year institutions.

An effective undergraduate curriculum should consist of a number of attributes. The curriculum should consist of a logical and consistent pattern of courses having a cumulative impact on students' intellectual development. There may, of course, be different patterns, but each should reflect logicality and consistency. A curriculum consisting of year-long sequences in English, History, Philosophy, Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Political Science could be considered as an appropriate pattern, whereas a curriculum consisting of short-course or one-term or semester sampling of thirty or forty different subjects could properly be judged deficient.

Whatever logical and consistent pattern of courses is selected, it should expose students over time to several intellectual traditions. An undergraduate program which insured that students have some in-depth exposure to the Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and modes of communication could be viewed as appropriate, whereas the curriculum which allowed students to study nothing but varieties of communication would fail to meet this criterion. A second tradition is an epistemological one which suggests that the undergraduate program should expose students over time to many different ways of knowing, from intuition to the driest sort of empiricism. A curricular program which exposed students to Plastic Arts, Music, Theater, History, Political Science, Economics, Chemistry, Biology, Physics, and Mathematics would provide a needed balance, whereas a total program which concentrated on interpersonal human relationships would be deficient.

A third characteristic of an effective undergraduate curriculum is that, in aggregate, it should have a reasonably high degree of verbal, numerical and conceptual sophistication. This means that an undergraduate program which, for the most part, developed primarily even a high degree of technical competence as, for example, the technical skills of nursing, would be open to serious criticism.

Lastly, the undergraduate curriculum should be designed to develop an intellectual base upon which more mature study can be undertaken. The clearest exemplification of this criterion would be the requirement of a logical, coherent, and consistent major which develops the sophisticated insights needed to make application of the subject or build on it.

The positive and negative sides of these characteristics can be seen in an example of an effective and an ineffective undergraduate program. In the effective program, while there are clearly gaps of potentially desirable material, there is a pattern of year-long courses from which a logic is discernible. The ineffective program (while it might seem to be a caricature) could very well yield a Bachelor's degree and a secondary school teaching credential, but very little intellectual consistency.

An Effective Undergraduate Curriculum

- Freshman:
    - English
    - Algebra
    - U.S. History
    - Chemistry
- Sophomore:
    - American Literature
    - History of Civilization
    - Principles of Sociology
    - Statistics
- Junior:
    - Music
    - Political Science
    - Urban Sociology
    - Organizational Theory
- Senior:
    - Philosophy
    - Economics
    - Social Psychology
    - Social Stratification

An Ineffective Undergraduate Curriculum

Freshman:

- Black Studies
- American Constitutional History
- Spanish
- English
- Effective Living
- Entomology
- Criminology

Sophomore:

- Studio Art
- Abnormal Psychology
- Scandinavian Literature in Translation
- Principles of Economics
- Greece in the Age of Pericles
- Accounting
- Philosophy of Education
- Principles of Secondary Education

Junior:

- American Studies
- Modern American Poetry
- Agricultural Education
- Sociology of Personality
- Techniques of Teaching
- History of Education
- American Intellectual History
- Modern Drama

Senior:

- Practice Teaching
- Methods of Teaching Humanities
- Music Appreciation
- Religion
- Photography
- Mythology
- American as Civilization
- Educational Research

In the effective curriculum each course is a year long thus enabling some sustained and disciplined effort over time. The course of study contains a strong, but not an overpowering, major in sociology, and the various courses such as English, Chemistry, Music and Philosophy introduce students to a variety of ways of knowing. The ineffective curriculum consists of a number of different one semester courses which neither relate to one another in any apparent way, nor is there a clear major except in a somewhat logically eratic concentration in professional education. While each of the courses listed could be well visualized as effective and demanding, the aggregation is so varied as to make one suspect that there will not be a total curricular impact.

Pre World War II Curricular Development

The undergraduate curricular situation as it existed just prior to World War II presented a number of common features and some experimentation in programs in Liberal Arts and Sciences. The distribution system prevailed which asked that students take a specified number of courses in each of the domains of Science, Social Science, and Humanities, with the choice being from any of the relevant departments. In addition, students were typically required to take English or Rhetoric, one or two years of foreign language, and Physical Education. In the undergraduate professional schools, such as Agriculture, Engineering, Commerce, Home Economics, or Education, students concentrated on technical and professional courses, with some modest requirements of taking one or two courses outside the school in such fields as literature or music. The courses in such programs were taught by an increasingly professional faculty with the desirability of the Ph.D. coming to be the theoretical norm, although, throughout the country, less than a quarter of all four-year college faculty members held such a degree. The courses in both small and large-sized institutions were increasingly developed as sequences in the disciplinary major, although they were used as a means toward general education of students.

There was some curricular experimentation which, in a way, predicted the shape of things to come. In Columbia College, John Erskine developed a general education course based on the great books of the Western civilization which would serve as a forerunner for the major concern with general education after World War II. Stringfellow Barr revolutionized St. John's College by installing a completely required four-year curriculum based exclusively on the great books of the Western tradition. At Wisconsin, a two-year experimental college was created, with the first year concentrating on Greece in the Age of Pericles and the second year on the United States during the 1930s. At Bennington College, Sarah Lawrence College, and Stephens College, there was serious experimentation with a completely free elective system made plausible by insuring that students' selection of courses would be made only after intensive consultation with an advisor. Antioch College had made cooperative work study central to its curriculum, and Swarthmore had developed a widely-known honors program which allowed approximately half of the Juniors and Seniors to put together an individually-tailored curriculum which would culminate in comprehensive examinations conducted by external examiners.

By and large, collegiate curricula prior to World War II were not particularly demanding except in some of the professional fields. Colleges and universities were not particularly selective with respect to students, typically accepting all high school graduates who applied and whose pattern of high school courses was reasonably academic. The "Gentleman's C" has not yet been discredited, and social and athletic events were deemed as being perhaps more important for a college education than the curriculum. Fraternities and sororities had reached their zenith in campus regard, the football week-end was of paramount significance, and the big dance, played for by big name bands, focused student interest and whatever finances students could accumulate. Missing or "cutting" classes was accepted behavior, as was concentration on single textbooks per course.

Rise and Fall of General Education

There can be little doubt but what the general education movement, which began before World War II but which flowered afterward, was the most systematic and far-reaching effort to establish curricular quality and integrity from approximately 1930 through to the 1980's. General education was conceived of that part of undergraduate education which insured a breadth of educational experience and sought to prepare students for their non-vocational lives as self-actualizing individuals, effective family members, productive citizens, and leisure-enjoying human beings. It consisted of different types of programs put together after intensive faculty study and effort, which came to be curricular expressions as to what knowledge was worth knowing. The creation of new general education curricula took place in response to a variety of failures and weaknesses. It was a protest against the abuses of the free elective system, which made higher education resemble an intellectual cafeteria, with no guiding principles and with no means of conveying to students any feeling for the unity of life. It was also a protest against the pattern of constructing sequences of courses for disciplinary elegance and then expecting them to be used by students for general education purposes. It was a protest against students enrolling, for example, in the Principles of Psychology course for reasons of personal development, only to find that the course was designed as the foundation for those few students who would ultimately major in Psychology and proceed to advanced graduate work in that field. It also represented a serious attempt to rectify deficiencies of pre-war collegiate education, such as the high and sustained dropout rate and the fact that college graduates did not appear significantly different than non-college graduates, with respect to reading habits, citizenship practices, or uses of leisure. Above all, general education represented a serious effort on the part of faculties to reach agreement as to what students should study, and to find some way to insure an integrity and synthesis which could be assimilated by undergraduate students.

The form of general education programs differed somewhat from institution to institution, however the essence of what general education was attempting to achieve is revealed in the actual program at the College of the University of Chicago and the rationale developed by the faculty of Harvard College. Over a thirteen-year period, the University of Chicago developed a prescribed four-year curriculum consisting of interdisciplinary courses taught by faculty not preoccupied with research demands, using elaborate syllabi and forcing students to examine only original sources in place of relying on single textbooks. Grades were to be assigned, not by instructors, but by an impersonal university examiner responsible for creating comprehensive examinations for each of the fourteen year-long sequences students were expected to master. While students could elect a few specialized courses, those would not be allowed to substitute for the especially-contrived courses expressing the general education ideal. The curriculum, as it became crystallized by 1947, consisted of a series of one-year courses: first year, Social Sciences I, Humanities I, Natural Science I, and English; second year, Social Sciences II, Humanities II, Natural Sciences II, and Mathematics; third year, Social Sciences III, Humanities III, Natural Sciences III, and foreign language; fourth year, History and an integrating course called Observation, Interpretation and Integration.

What made the Chicago program a significant prototype which would affect practice throughout the country during the 1950's and early 1960's were several elements. First, it was a prescribed program based on firm faculty agreement as to what things undergraduates should master. Second, it was taught by the faculty which considered the college the most important element of their professional lives and whose attention would not be diminished by other university obligations. Third, the quality of syllabi was extraordinarily high, with each resulting from intensive faculty collaboration, with each guiding students through a richness of original sources. Compared to the attractively printed and illustrated Chicago syllabi, course outlines from other institutions appeared primitive and fragmentary. The very quality of the Chicago documents symbolized the regard in which the faculty held the curriculum. Especially important was the stress placed on mastery demonstrated through the medium of comprehensive examinations. The emphasis on mastery and flexibility which the examination system provided is described by the college faculty: "By the end of the Academic Year 1945-1946, the college had, in reality, become a four-year program in which students were placed on the basis of their performance on examinations, irrespective of whether they had spend two, three, four, or five years in high school or even a year or two in another college, or in an Army training course. For example, high school graduates were no longer given credit for the first year's work in the Social Sciences on the basis of a year's course in American History. On the other hand, students who, as a result of independent work, had mastered a portion of a given area or subject matter deemed a part of general education by the faculty were not held for college comprehensive examinations merely because they lacked 'paper credits.' Such a procedure, of course, was complementary to an existing practice -- adopted in 1931 -- of permitting students to take comprehensive examinations whenever they felt ready for them. One of the several noteworthy results which this scheme of placement brought forth was the means to handle the veterans who came to the university in great numbers in 1946 and 1947. A 22-year-old veteran could be placed in the same class with a 16-year-old student just finished with his sophomore year of high school--both knowing that they had been judged by the same standards as needing a certain program of studies. Further, if the veteran, as a result of his maturity, was able to prepare himself for a comprehensive examination--say, in the Physical Sciences--after three months of residence, he could take the examination and, if successful, satisfy the requirement, while the youngster plugged away in classes acquiring knowledge of science and the ability to deal with scientific proglems."

The influence of the general education program of the College of the University of Chicago on the national movement was profound, but was exerted by individuals who had been exposed to that program, rather than through the publication of a book, which was how Harvard subsequently exercised its influence. Whether the institution was small, such as Pennsylvania College for Women (subsequently renamed Chatham College), or large, such as Michigan State University, the University of Puerto Rico, or the University of Florida, the existence of a core of required courses deriving from the great books of the Western tradition (modified, of course, to suit local conditions), for the most part separate faculties, and the use of comprehensive examinations to establish students' grades, rested with leadership who had had personal Chicago experience. For example, at Chatham College, the Academic Dean, Thomas H. Hamilton, and the Director of Testing had been intimately involved with the

College of the University of Chicago; and at Michigan State University, the intimate consultant to the president was Floyd W. Reeves, long on the faculty at Chicago. The first director of the Board of Examiners had been exposed to the Chicago thinking through workshops and participation in the Cooperative Study of General Education which had its headquarters at the University of Chicago and was directed by Ralph W. Tyler, the University Examiner responsible for the system of comprehensive examinations.

The actual program at the University of Chicago served as a model which would influence practice across the country. The program of general education at Harvard College never really was put into effect the way it was planned. However, the theory of general education which was developed by the Harvard faculty and published in a report entitled General Education in a Free Society provided a theoretical rationale which would guide or at least flavor faculty discussions from 1945 onward. The list of objectives for general education, published in that document, informally called the "Redbook," began to appear in college catalogs and recommendations for curriculum reform almost immediately. Levine summarized the essence of those objectives thusly: ". . . general education was distinct from education for specialization. It embraced the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, emphasizing their changes. General education helped people 'to think effectively, to communicate thoughts, to make relevant judgments, and to discriminate among values.' It further aimed at developing the whole person, affectively as well as intellectually, by reconciling the needs of the individual and society. In order to provide such education, which the committee thought should 'remain in goal and essential teaching the same for all,' the Redbook recommended slightly different programs for students of varying ages, abilities, and outlooks." These objectives were to be achieved through requiring that six out of the sixteen year-long required courses for graduation be general education courses specifically designed for such purposes. These would be interdisciplinary courses and would not be allowed to count as credit in a major. The entire program would be the responsibility of a committee on general education chaired by the Dean of the Faculty. The new program contrasted sharply with Harvard's previous utilization of a distribution requirement, and, while the Harvard faculty approved the recommendation in principle, in practice the program was never fully put into effect, probably because it represented too stark departure from the practices of the disciplinary preoccupied faculty of arts and sciences (Levine, 1978, pp. 359-361).

The idea of general education caught the fancy of the post-war educational community. Its objectives were given national visibility through the publication of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education. Its presumed outcomes were studied and publicized by the American Council on Education Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education, and new program developments were publicized by the highly active Committee on General Education of the Association for Higher Education. During the early 1950s, Dressel and Mayhew estimated that perhaps 250 to 300 institutions were adopting new programs each year for three or four years. Regardless of the format adopted by different institutions, all programs embraced a consistent set of intellectual beliefs. All placed the individual human being as the focus of curricular development, rather than the traditional focus on discipline. A frequent graphic metaphor was a circle, the center of which symbolized Man. The circle was divided into quadrants labelled Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Communicative Arts.

All, in one way or another, tried to achieve some degree of an interdisciplinary quality. Some institutions created new courses such as Humanities, drawing on the History of Western Civilization, Music, Philosophy, and the Arts. Others sought to combine disciplinary courses in such a way as to produce interdisciplinary insights. Third, all sought to stress rationality and virtually all elevated critical or analytical thinking as a transcendent outcome, and all were preoccupied with the Western intellectual tradition and struggled mightily to project a contemporary synthesis of that tradition. Although all expressed a concern for affective qualities and values, typically the concern was put into effect through rational, rather than emotional means. And the rhetoric of the general education movement contrasted sharply with the educational rhetoric as it began to develop from the late 1960's onward. The operative words were "academic rigor," "comprehensive examinations," "interdisciplinary," "philosophically based," "critical, analytical or rational thinking," "achievement of specified educational objectives," and "applying academic concepts to the solution of human problems."

The intellectual achievement of the general education movement began to deteriorate by the late 1950's, and by the late 1960's the movement was in complete rout. The reasons for the decline may be quickly summarized. New interdisciplinary courses were extraordinarily difficult to teach and taxed the disciplinary-developed competencies of professors. Few institutions had the resources or the will to create separate faculties which would spend full time developing and teaching new kinds of courses, and thus faculties were torn between giving attention to their own disciplinary courses and the new interdisciplinary ones. In such a struggle, the disciplinary would inevitably win out. The relative power of the two staffing approaches was well illustrated by the University of Minnesota, which expected faculties in the college of Science, Literature, and the Arts to offer general education courses, and at Michigan State University, which created a Dean for General Education who was given a budget and full complement of faculty positions. At Minnesota, the Division of General Education lasted but a few years, whereas at Michigan State it lasted almost forty years.

Intellectually, the general education movement was based on the intellectual hegemony of the Western tradition. During the 1950's, other traditions and cultures such as Oriental civilizations began to intrude and it was found that those new influences could not be accommodated in any overriding synthesis. The movement was dealt a death blow by two major external events. The first of these was the successful Russian launching of a satellite, calling into question the presumed United States scientific and technological superiority. The immediate response was to restore disciplinary rigor to both secondary schools and colleges and universities, which was antithetical to the interdisciplinary quality of general education. Even more significant was the sudden shortage of college faculty members beginning in about 1960, which gave faculty members the power to insist on teaching whatever courses the individual wished, and individuals did not wish to teach staff developed courses in general education which required much effort to become acquainted with several disciplines. A small Ohio institution, Denison University, had developed a remarkably effective program in general education reflecting elements of the Chicago model. However, by the mid 1960's, it had to be dismantled because new, well-trained and desired assistant professors simply could not accept appointment at Denison if they were to be expected to teach interdisciplinary courses.

Rise and Fall of Selectivity

The second qualitative peak was of a different order, and in a very real sense, reflected the triumph of academic disciplines over the interdisciplinary. This was the shift to insuring curricular quality through selectivity of students.

Historically institutions have selected students for entry into college with different techniques in different times and according to the region of the country. Before the emergence of schools, students were selected exclusively by means of an examination, frequently administered orally to determine students' competency in handling Latin and Greek. Gradually as the number of prospective students increased, oral examinations became impossible and written examinations replaced them to such an extent that by 1910 a body was created to standardize entrance examinations for those students applying to a small number of Eastern seaboard institutions. As secondary schools evolved and as their standards became higher, colleges and universities, particularly in the Mid-West, began to use academic performance in secondary schools as a criterion for admissions. Thus, the college admissions picture before World War II was somewhat mixed. The private Eastern institutions tended to require performance on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests and rank in secondary school class for admission purposes. A few states such as Florida, Iowa and Michigan had various forms of state-wide testing programs and applicants to the public institutions had to submit test performance records and high school academic performance as evidence of their ability to cope with collegiate work. The majority of the state institutions and private institutions in the Mid-West and South required only the possession of a high school diploma for admission purposes. Particularly in the senior state institutions there was a myth that relatively open admissions was justified because the rigor of the freshmen year would screen out students who could not perform. It was from that period that the aprocryphal tale emerged of the university president telling the assembled freshmen to look to their right and left because one of those two neighbors would not be around after the first semester. It is difficult to tell whether that deliberate institutional selectivity through attrition was carried on at all. Overall, college drop-out rates remained substantially the same in the pre-war years and in the several decades afterwards. Institutional record keeping was primitive and even during the early 1950s public institutions could not present evidence as to the reasons why different students dropped out.

In a very real sense selection into colleges and universities just prior to, and just after World War II, was a matter of self selection with institutions accepting virtually all individuals who applied, who had a high school diploma and who did not present excessively low test performance when admission tests were required. Students lacking aptitude and achievement in secondary schools simply did not apply to college. This was true of even those institutions which ultimately became highly selective. However, by the beginning of World War II an ethos and a technology of selectivity had emerged especially along the Eastern seaboard which would be utilized nationally once conditions arose which allowed selectivity. In addition to the college entrance examination board and the new state-wide testing programs there were other agencies seeking to establish qualitative standards for admissions into various collegiate levels. The Cooperative Test Service provided achievement tests which could be used for admissions. The Graduate Record Examination was developed to evaluate fitness for admission to graduate study and in time the National Teacher Examination was developed to test qualification for teaching. And the powers of prediction to do college work was examined through such efforts as the Eight Year Study which established that particular subject matter requirements were substantially less significant in predicting college performance than the ability of the student as established by psychological tests.

The late 1940s and 1950s saw a number of developments which would profoundly affect the selectivity of colleges and universities in the 1960s and beyond. The first and most significant of these was the creation of the Educational Testing Service in 1947 which would take over the technical testing work of the College Entrance Examination Board, the Educational Records Bureau, the Cooperative Test Service, the Psychological Test of the American Council on Education and the Graduate Record Office of the Carnegie Foundation. Under the terms of agreement, each of those agencies was either reimbursed to terminate testing activities (as for example the American Council on Education) or agreed to purchase testing services as for example the College Entrance Examination. The Educational Testing Service immediately moved to improve the quality of testing and to conduct considerable research as to how best to select students for collegiate work. As the Educational Testing Service became operational, institutions in the Middle-West and Far West began to join the College Entrance Examination Board and to use the Scholastic Aptitude Tests and various other occasional testing service instruments in their admission effort.

The likely need for such services was underscored when in 1954 the registrar of Ohio State University examined 1950 census figures and predicted that there would likely be a tidal wave of college applications by 1960, and that institutions would need some mechanism to select students for limited college spaces. Ronald Thompson's predictions proved to be in the right direction, but overly conservative. Desire for admissions to college increased substantially with different responses taking place in different situations. The private institutions did expand capacity somewhat, but sought to limit enrollment by requiring higher and higher test performance and secondary school academic performance. During those early 1960s directors of admissions would report each year with pride that the SAT scores of entering freshmen had increased by a certain amount. A few well known institutions became so attractive to applicants that they could if they chose to accept only the upper one to five percent of high school graduating classes. Harvard was one institution whose dean of admissions actually warned the faculty that Harvard could become so selective as ultimately to destroy its base of support as future corporate executives, lawyers, medical doctors and engineers were denied admissions, and their lost places were taken by future professors and other intellectuals. Dean Bender argued that Harvard should enroll students with many different talents, and not just those with academic talent. He thought it wise that football talent, dramatic talent, journalistic talent and managerial talent were equally needed if Harvard were to prepare people for successful life in a variegated American society. Harvard and a few other places attended to such warnings and sought to add other elements to the admissions equation, but with the base still remaining high school performance and test performance.

Similar selectivity began to take place in public senior institutions as they began to use grade point average and test scores to limit enrollments with those not meeting standards accommodated in the less or non selective junior community colleges which states began to create during the 1960s to accommodate increased demand. The movement toward selectivity in public institutions in the South was given an unexpected boost by the 1954 Supreme Court decisions legally eliminating segregated educational institutions. In a number of southern states it appeared likely that essentially a segregated status could be achieved through vigorous admissions requirements of test scores and high school performance and so southern state universities moved quickly toward greater selectivity.

It should be pointed out that many institutions both public and private continued the practice of admitting virtually any student who applied who had a high school diploma. Two year publicly supported community junior colleges in many states were required by law to do so, but a substantial majority of private institutions expanded their physical plant through increased enrollments, which they preferred rather than remaining small and becoming more selective. In such institutions the 1960s saw a doubling of enrollment and a doubling of tuition which provided those private colleges and universities the first relative affluence they had had in their 100 year history. Nevertheless, the spirit of selectivity prevailed even in those institutions which in fact were unselective. Institutions joined the College Entrance Examination Board or adopted programs of the American College Testing Program as a symbolic gesture that they were becoming more selective. The doctrine was pervasive that high grades were required in rigorous academic high school programs in order to enter a selective college or university. High grades in demanding collegiate programs were required if students could enter increasingly selective graduate and professional schools.

And high performance in prestigious graduate and professional schools was essential to obtain teaching posts in prestigious institutions, residencies in major teaching hospitals, or junior memberships in major law firms or clerkships to senior judges. Some institutions such as Harvard, Carlton, Oberlin or Stanford became so selective that they would accept only one out of every seven to ten students who applied.

The intellectual basis for the victory of selectivity was the virtue of meritocracy and the essentiality of a status system. Thus, institutions were categorized as "big league," "minor league," "bush league," and "academic Siberia," depending on the degree to which they could be selective, both with respect to students and to faculty. The curricular expression was "increased proliferation of specialized courses," "increased rigor required for work in a major," "increased use of quantification," and "enhanced valuing of the concept of academic excellence" as defined by professors offering courses for graduate students as the first preference, while, at best, tolerating undergraduate students seeking other than disciplinary and intellectual goals.

There are two ideals in American higher education -- the Jeffersonian one, which would make higher education accessible to all, but that it be demanding with respect to achievement; and the Jacksonian goal of treating every individual as equal and equally entitled to higher education, regardless of individual capacity. The two curricular peaks are really reflective of the Jeffersonian goal, although some have argued that general education was really egalitarian. The idea of general education as practiced at the University of Chicago was clearly Jeffersonian in the sense of exposing students in a demanding way to the high culture of the civilization.

Certainly the disciplinary emphasis of the time of selectivity was anything but Jacksonian. It insisted that students conform to and comply with the stringent intellectual demands made by an increasingly intellectual professoriate.

The deterioration of an emphasis on merit and achievement began seriously between 1968 and 1970, although there had been earlier events anticipating that decline. One of the earliest indications of a decline was the inflation of academic grades which seems to have taken place as the result of two quite distinctive forces. The first, paradoxically, occurred as a product of high selectivity. The historic use of a curve of grade distribution insured that a certain proportion of students would receive low grades and another proportion would receive high grades. As the measured academic ability of students in selective institutions began to rise, it began to appear unfair to penalize a high-ability student with a C simply because of the performance of that student's peer group. It was argued that in highly selective institutions virtually all students should be expected to achieve at the A or B level, and institutions began to inaugurate new grading systems such as eliminating the grades of D and F, making the grades A, B, C, or No Grade. The other inflationary measure seems to have derived from the student demand for relevance during the era of campus dissent. It was argued that eliminating vulnerability to failure would encourage students to explore new subjects and might insure greater rapport between students and faculty. The typical technique was the Pass/Fail or +/- system, with the implicit understanding that virtually no one would receive a failing grade. As a result of such forces, modal college grades moved from a C to a B, and in some programs and institutions, the modal grade became an A, with the assignment of a grade of B a signal that the student might be headed for academic difficulty. The expulsion of students or placing them on probation because of academic failure virtually disappeared. For example, during the 1970's, no students were expelled from the University of California, Berkeley by virtue of academic failure. By the 1980's, a few institutions had become alarmed because of grade inflation and began to take counter measures, such as restoring the grade of D in order to make a C acceptable and a B respectable. However, throughout the country, significant damage had been done, especially in many of the non-traditional programs, to such an extent that there was really no way of determining actual achievement represented by earned academic credit. A passing grade could signify achievement with great distinction or virtually, but not absolute, failure.

The second indicator of retreat from meritocracy was the decline of selective admissions as many institutions began to experience enrollment problems during the 1970's. In effect, this phenomenon was a return to earlier practices of admitting all applicants who had graduated from high school, but it also could be considered an absolute qualitative deterioration. Many more high school graduates with quite deficient academic recrods were applying to college during the late 1960's than had applied during the late 1940's. In many private liberal arts colleges, all applicants with high school diplomas came to be accepted, and in some states, such as California, public two-year junior colleges were required by law to accept all high school graduates regardless of their ability or prior academic performance.

Relevant to indications of qualitative decline, the long-term significance of which cannot yet be argued, was the precipitous decline in the measured academic aptitude of college applicants beginning in the mid 1960's, after several decades of rather steady increase in ability. On the 200 to 800 point scale, mathematics scores declined from a high of 502 in 1963 to 470 in 1977, and verbal scores declined from 478 to 429. Those scores were from the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board, and similar patterns of decline have characterized other large scale ability testing programs. If the academic ability of college freshman declines and, at the same time, college grades go up, this permits the inference, at least, that there has been a curricular qualitative deterioration in colleges and universities. This point can be illustrated at the University of California: "Prior to 1968, a student attending one of the campuses of the University of California was automatically exempted from remedial English composition, more familiarly known as 'Bonehead English.' if he scored higher than 600 on the English achievement test, . . . despite the fact that the cutoff score for exemption was reduced to 550 in 1968, the percentage of freshman required to take this course increased from less than 35% in the early 1950's to well over 50% in the mid 1970's. In August 1976, the University of California proposed abolishing 'Bonehead English' as a separate course and merging it with freshman English, which is required of all entering students. When a majority of students require remedial assistance, it is no longer labelled 'remedial' (Copperman, 1978, p. 41).

In the light of this decline in academic aptitude, which is essentially the ability to use words and numbers, it is significant as an index of curricular qualitative decline that as earlier noted the number of collegiate institutions requiring English, foreign language, and Mathematics declined significantly between 1967 and 1974. English requirements declined from 90% of institutions to 72%; for foreign language the decline in proportion of institutions requiring it was 72% to 53%; and the decline for Mathematics requirements declined from 33% to 20% (Blackburn, et al, 1976, p.34).

Curricular Reform of the 1960's and 1970's

The backing away from general education and the decline in selectivity and measured evidence of academic performance are facts. However, before the significance of those facts can be gauged, other curricular elements of the late 1960's and 1970's must be considered. Most important of those elements was a growing anti-intellectualism or, at least, a growing spirit of anti-academic in commentary regarding the substance of higher education such as was reported in Chapter II, and called non-traditional. It is difficult to uncover the curricular beliefs of advocates of non-traditional education because so much of the writing stresses egalitarian needs and barriers to traditional college education which ought to be, conceivably, removed. They argued that there are many different groups of people whose needs, situations, or conditions were not suited to traditional modes of education but who, nevertheless, should be served in ways discreet to them--the aged, incapacitated, incarcerated, or the temperamentally different. They further pointed out that there were a number of barriers preventing such people from obtaining needed educational services -- geographic, scheduling, financial, transferrability of academic credit, and irrelevance of seeming irrelevance of orthodox definitions of education. The actual specification of curriculum, however, were typically exhortative -- providing something for the alienated who really do not want to be in college or those who had had unsatisfactory educational experiences -- or instrumental -- joint student and faculty program design, using a broad mix of educational resources, use of adjunct professors and major emphasis on independent study and learning. But actual curricular substance remains obscure and must be inferred. Cutting through non-traditional rhetoric yields these essentials: content of the curriculum is whatever an individual wishes to study, sequence is determined situationally, that is, whatever is most convenient to students, and, pedagogically, the assignment of credit for whatever kind of experience appears to modify human behavior.

Experiential Learning

Another essential component of the anti-academic, was the stress on experiential learning and the award of academic credit for such experience. As was true of the literature concerning non-traditional education, the statements about experiential learning tended to be exhortative, supporting egalitarian beliefs ". . . if an individual's tastes in leisure include Bridge, or citizen action for equal rights, or new trends in diet and meditation, there should be readily available opportunities for both improvement of the individual's competence and reconsideration of his or her outlook," (Keeton, 1976, p. 7) and critical of formal traditional higher education. For example, "The Achiles' heel is that credit hours do not signify directly what has been learned or achieved, but represent a time served measure that correlates only roughly, and in unknown ways and degrees, with what has been learned (Ibid,p.14). Through inference, however, academic credit (thus defining the curriculum) would be granted for military experiences, for foreign travel, for preventative medicine sequences of activities, for patronizing libraries, or for whatever other sort of an experience an individual had had or would obtain which modified behavior in desired directions. The position is epitomized as "Above all we must cultivate a new spirit that accepts the educative value and worth of all experience, not merely that which is devoted to scholarly study or which is guided at every step by professors" (Ibid, p. 10).

A third element is the suggested substitution of feeling and emotion for cognition as a way of organizing the undergraduate curriculum. Affective or emotional concerns had long been attended to by collegiate institutions through such extra-curricular activities as Hell Week in fraternities and sororities, Homecoming weekends, and songs praising Alma Mater. However, by the late 1960's and early 1970's, explicit curricular concern for feeling and emotion was being urged, especially in some of the experimental colleges. The catalog statement announcing the opening of Kresge College of the University of California, Santa Cruz in 1970 captures the intent: "Santa Cruz' sixth liberal arts college will explore educational innovation through a human relations approach. Just as Man's natural environment is a result of a delicate balance and interdependency, so the excitement and creativity of a learning environment is a result of open, direct, and explicit relationships." At Kresge, the curriculum was essentially to be individual feelings and self expression with T-group encounters a major pedagogical tool, defined as sensitivity training groups of persons who meet together for the purposes of exploring mutual feelings and interactions.

Such concern for non-cognitive affairs probably had its roots in what was called the student development movement, championed by such individuals as Nevitt Sanford and Joseph Katz. That movement was based on a belief that each state of the development of human beings presented its own unique needs which should be met if growth and development were to take place. The developmental needs of post-adolescent 18-22-year-olds were seen as being more emotional and affective than cognitive. Mayhew epitomized those needs thusly: "College students seek ways to extend or expand their impulse life more adequately to use powers of affection or emotion for total personal development. They demand freedom to explore in ways consistent to them, and are inclined to decry the rat race of prerequisites and too many courses. Although they get their greatest satisfactions from the peer group culture and are searching for ways to make themselves independent of their families, they nonetheless search for adequate and appropriate role models with whom to identify or test their own emerging feelings of personal identity. Especially do they look to these role models for help as they move into full adult stages. Perhaps the most common goal students choose is greater self understanding and greater awareness of their own identities. They sense that to move toward self understanding they must find greater group identification and more powerful ways of relating intimately with other people."

"It now seems that courses having a heavier load of emotion and affection would be more attuned to the developmental needs of college-aged youth. Thus during the freshman year, courses in Art, Music or Philosophy, if geared to exploring the questions of young people, might be more appropriate. There probably is ample time later in the college career for the young person to develop necessary cognitive skills which, seemingly, will come from disciplinary courses" (Mayhew, 1969, pp. 11-12).

Formal, voluntary, regional accreditation seems also to have added its influence to an anti-academic flavor to the undergraduate curriculum. During much of the history of voluntary accreditation, rather rigid quantitative standards, with respect to program characteristics, were enforced. Accreditation looked for financial strength, library holdings, preparation of faculty, and curricular conformity to an understood conventional wisdom as to what should be the component elements of an undergraduate curriculum. Thus, there was general agreement that there should be a general education component, and reviewers felt that they could know what was and was not a coherent, consistent program. However, toward the end of the 1960's, accreditation moved toward a radical new posture, forced in part to do so by charges of inflexibility and insensitivity to innovation and change. This new position posited that each institution would set its own purposes, goals, and objectives and would be evaluated in the light of those indigenous purposes, rather than by comparison with programs offered at other institutions. Thus, if an institution sets as a major goal to enhance community sense of racial integrity in a ghetto area inhabited primarily by Chicanos and Blacks, then the institution should be evaluated in terms of that purpose, rather than in terms of whether or not its students develop verbal and numerical proficiency. This doctrine of using self-designated mission as an evaluative criterion has resulted in granting candidate or accredited status to programs distinctly at variance with recognized qualitative standards. Thus, the Western College Association granted candidacy status to a southern California institution which typically granted a Bachelor's degree for one year of quasi-academic work and a display of evidence of a variety of life experiences presumed to have had educational value. One student, for example, was assigned a year of academic credit for having been reared in a ghetto, another year for having lived in an unmarried state with a doctoral student, and another year for having been active in community organization activities. Those experiences, coupled with thirty weeks of academic work, each work having four hours of formal class, earned the Baccalaureate degree.

Cluster Colleges

In addition to those extreme sorts of reforms there were other reforms which did not reject the academic but sought to improve it. The most widely publicized and seemingly most promising for lasting results were the creation of subunits within institutions, changing academic calendars and uses of academic time, creation of interdisciplinary courses, and efforts to incorporate off-campus experience into the structure of an academic curriculum. None of these lived up to their promise, and none of these markedly altered the complexion of the undergraduate curriculum.

By 1960 it became apparent that institutions would inevitably grow in size, which would quite likely produce an increase in educational impersonality. Throughout the country, efforts were undertaken to create colleges within colleges, or to develop large institutions consisting of many small autonomous units. Frequently there was also an attempt to give each of these subunits a distinctive characteristic. Stephens College of Columbia, Missouri created a house plan which consisted of a hundred students and five faculty members who would use a single residence hall for learning and for living. Faculty members had offices in the residence hall, and most courses were taught there. The University of the Pacific created three cluster colleges, each consisting of a theoretical 250 students and an indigenous faculty, with the program being offered in each of the specifically designed residence units. The University of California at Santa Cruz was designed to become a 20,000-student university divided into separate colleges of between 700 and 1000 students, each with residence, instructional, and library facilities. At the University of Michigan, an experimental college was created in the belief that a smaller, more coherent situation would be a desirable alternative to students proceeding through the large, departmentalized college of Science, Literature, and The Arts. Western Washington State University created a new college immediately adjacent to the main campus which was comprised of small, 50-individual-capacity residence units designed to be used for both learning and living purposes. And Michigan State University created several large cluster colleges which would house students and offer a partially prescribed curriculum taught by indigenous faculty spending full-time teaching within the college. As these innovations were undertaken, at least one (University of California, Santa Cruz) enjoyed an immediate popularity with heavy enrollment pressures. However, within a very short period of time, with one major exception, these cluster or satellite colleges began to decline. They did not attract the number of students anticipated. And, among students who did enroll, high attrition rates became the rule. Faculty members who were encouraged to attend to both college concerns and departmental and disciplinary concerns chose their disciplinary interests to the detriment of the unique qualities which were supposed to characterize the various subunits. Within a relatively short time, these colleges began to decline, with the most rapid decline taking place in those colleges which sought to depart most radically from traditional curriculum concerns. The only major exception to this deterioration of the concept of cluster or satellite college was at Michigan State University. Probably the reason colleges such as the Justin Morrill College persisted was that it made use of the prescribed program of general education which had been in place and offered by an autonomous faculty since the end of World War II. For a large institution, having a separate faculty teaching courses required of all students in classes typically of 40 or 50 students is an economically efficient curricular situation. At Michigan State, the tuition and appropriation income generated by those large and prescribed courses could support the smaller, upper division courses in a cluster college. When institutions attempted to create a distinctive curriculum for each of several relatively small colleges, the instructional cost tended to become prohibitive. As of 1981, the concept of small cluster or satellite colleges within traditional campuses appears to be no longer valid and no longer attracts attention. Many institutions, of course, had begun to operate many financially successful smaller programs in off-campus situations. These, however, were made profitable through using exclusively inexpensive methods of instruction, part-time faculty, a great deal of self-service (called independent study), and inexpensive rented or borrowed physical facilities. Institutions seeking to use full-time, fully ranked faculties, separate and expensive physical facilities, and expensive teaching techniques such as small groups and tutorials found they simply could not afford the price -- especially since the smaller units did not attract student enrollment.

Changed Temporal Arrangements

A second innovation having presumably curricular implications consisted of the many attempts during the 1960s to change academic calendars and to break the temporal lock-step of undergraduate education. The historic temporal arrangements consisted of perhaps two-thirds of all institutions using a semester system and one-third using a quarter or term system, and with all institutions assuming that normal student progression toward a degree would consist of continuous enrollment during each academic year until the required credits had been accumulated and the degree received. Beginning in about 1960 and supported by impressive educational rationale, institutions began to experiment with new calendars. Some, such as the University of Pittsburgh or the state institutions in Florida, adopted the trimester system, intended to equalize enrollment throughout the calendar year, thereby gaining greater utilization of physical plant space. Other institutions which had been on the semester system moved to essentially the quarter system, as, for example, the 3-3 system of Dartmouth, which called for students to enroll for three 3-month segments taking three courses in each. Other institutions created an interim term between the Fall and early Winter semesters and the second semester beginning about February 1st. During the interim term, extending over Christmas vacation and throughout January, students were expected to undertake different sorts of educational experiences such as off-campus fieldwork or interdisciplinary team-taught, problems-oriented, on-campus activity. Other institutions tried still more radical changes, as did Colorado College when it embraced what it called a modular system, offering intensive courses for short periods of time, such as three weeks, followed by short, one-week intensive periods of relaxation. After two decades of temporal experimentation, it became apparent that some new calendars simply wouldn't work, such as the trimester system, which did not generate substantial Summer trimester enrollments or which, over time, simply eroded, as did the interim term which became little more than an extended intersession break. The most lasting effect was that institutions which maintained a semester system began Fall semester earlier so that the end of the semester came simultaneously with the beginning of Christmas vacation, thus eliminating the lame duck two or three weeks in January which had typically characterized the semester system. Relatively few institutions operating on the quarter system found it possible to limit students to three courses. Thus, the drift was back to the frenzy of three ten-week periods during which students took whatever number of courses they wished to conform with their graduation plans.

The second temporal arrangement was for institutions to make respectable, and even to encourage students, to drop out for varying lengths of time, or to defer entry as freshman for some time after graduation from high school. Earlier, dropping out of college was viewed as something of which to be ashamed. Then came the rationalization that stopping academic work for a time might help students gain perspective. For example, in the early 1960's Dartmouth developed a system of mandatory leaves-of-absence for students who were not performing academically up to the levels predicted by their potential. Beyond doubt, by the 1980's, there was much more discontinuity in college attending than had been true during the 1950's. However, it is possible to infer from past observations that dropping out from any but the most selective institutions probably contributes to discontinuing college attending plans and to the continuation of the high 50% attrition rate characteristic of higher education in the United States.

Off Campus Experince

One of the major curricular thrusts of the 1960's consisted of a variety of efforts to include in a systematic way some off-campus experience as an integral part of an undergraduate program. The two most widely adopted systems were 1) to provide students with an overseas experience, and 2) the system of cooperative education, which allowed students to alternate between on-campus academic work and off-campus work experience, ideally, related to whatever academic program was being pursued. The number of institutions making such efforts increased rather rapidly during the 1950's with respect to overseas programs (possibly at a rate of 15-20 a year) and during the 1960's with respect to cooperative education programs offered by 43 programs in 1953, 61 by 1960, and over 200 by 1970. Advocates of the two sorts of programs have been lavish in praise of what they can accomplish for student development and predict continued expansion into other institutions. In a few institutions which have made major financial and administrative investments in a pervasive system of cooperative education, such as the University of Cincinnati, Antioch College, Northeastern University, or the University of South Florida, the curricular significance has been great, as considerable attention was given to articulation between an academic program and work experience. In a few institutions, such as Oberlin, Smith, Stanford, or Lake Erie College, a substantial proportion of students went overseas for experiences directly related to their home campus academic programs. However, a strong impression persists that on most campuses claiming cooperative education, either it is a relatively small effort for particularly appropriate vocational curricula, or it is primarily a means of securing or financing part-time work for students, with the work being only accidentally linked to an academic program. Similarly, the number of students participating in formal overseas programs remains quite small, with a far greater number of students who gain overseas experience doing so through travel programs of one sort or another. The costs of mounting and maintaining a well-integrated cooperative education program or an overseas program are simply too great for most institutions to assume. While the strong examples of both sorts of programs can serve as models for institutions which wish to enter into the activity, and can provide lessons as to how academic and off-campus experiences can be systematicaly related, there is no reason to anticipate that such activities would ever become pervasive in higher education in the sense that general education did.

The major reforms suggested during the 1960's focused more on structure and time arrangement than on the actual content of courses and how they were taught. Even in subunits in which some radical substantive departure was undertaken, as in Kresge College, it was assumed that the faculty of the college knew what it was about in making curricular decisions. Over time more extreme reforms were suggested. These tended to be of two quite distinct sorts, and in a rough sort of way were related to the prestige and status of the institution's attempting them. First, there were those curricular ideas which seemed to require significant changes in faculty behavior and how faculty members actually organized their courses. These would include competency-based education, self-paced instruction, experiential learning, criterion-referenced instruction, and the evolution of a technical language with which to discuss curricular matters, such as "a systems approach to curriculum." These efforts seem to be found more frequently in the relatively weak institutions, academically marginal institutions, or institutions of relatively small size, created and organized to conform to a definite educational ideology. The other kind of reform essentially accepted the validity of academic courses and accepted styles of teaching but which, through requirements and patterns of courses, sought to rectify presumed curricular deficiencies. These efforts seemed to be more associated with the strong, prestigious, academically-conscious institutions such as the research universities and prestige liberal arts colleges.

Illustrative of the former kind of reform attempted and the use of a new technical language are statements regarding educational change at Austin

College in Texas: "The fundamental nature of the changes sought was apparent in the goals of the project -- for students to become more self directed in their learning, for faculty to become more skilled in facilitating the learning and maturation of students, and for the college to become more capable of sustaining institutional self renewal on a long-term continuing basis (Faust, 1979, p. 167).

Competence Based Education

From the standpoint of publicity and magnitude of claims, the concept of competence-based education during the 1970's compares with the concept of the cluster college or satellite college of the 1960's. "Competence-based education is a form of education that derives a curriculum from a specifcation of a set of outcomes; that so clearly states both the outcomes -- general and specific -- and the means by which they will be assessed that faculty, students, and interested third parties can make reasonably objective judgments with respect to student achievement or non-achievement or these outcomes; that tends to conceive learning experiences in terms of these outcomes; and that certifies student progress on the basis of demonstrated achievement of these outcomes" (Grant, 1979, p. 5-6). In general, the competence-based approach assumes that the purposes for every college course can be stated in quite specific terms describing human behaviors, that the development of those behaviors can be facilitated by quite specific learning activities, and that the demonstration of those behaviors can be measured with some precision. It assumes that educational practice is both an art and a science and that there are reasonably specific technical procedures which can produce specific kinds of outcomes. Ideally, the total faculty of an institution or of a subordinate school, college, or division, could get together and agree upon a large array of specific behaviors which the organization valued and wished to produce. Once that agreement had been reached, it was assumed that each faculty member would then reorganize his or her share of the program in such a way as to contribute to the development of some of those behaviors. The competence-based approach assumes a high degree of faculty cooperation with respect to the total curriculum. "There needs to be a great deal of coordination among faculty, between faculty and assessors (teachers and assessors are often different persons in competence programs), and between the administrators of the program and the practitioners in it. The amount of emotional and intellectual interdependence among faculty that is fostered by competence-based education sharply exceeds that of other interdisciplinary programs, themselves usually demanding in these respects" (Ibid, p. 227).

By 1982, the concept of competence-based education has been widely publicized and financially supported by foundations such as the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education but was typically practiced in relatively unknown institutions, such as Alverno College, Antioch School of Law, College for Human Services, College Four of Grand Valley State Colleges, College of Public and Community Service of the University of Massachusetts at Boston, Florida State University, Mount Hood Community College, and Seattle Central Community College, and the likelihood of the concept spreading to all of American higher education appears remote. " . . . Competence-based programs have had a high mortality rate. Perhaps because of their very demand, they have not proved particularly attractive to students; and in institutions where the faculty have the power to resist imposed change (such as well-established institutions with tenure), it has been difficult to win the loyalty of faculty to a competence-based approach.

Thus the programs at Florida State University have come to a virtual standstill, and a substantial segment of the Alverno College faculty has resigned, while those remaining have protested to the college's Board about the competence approach and its manner of implementation" (Ibid, p. 14).

Self Paced Instruction

A similar fate for similar reasons can be predicted for a related movement, which is partly curricular and partly instructional. This is the movement toward individual, self-paced learning. It assumes, as does competence-based education, that the desired outcomes of collegiate courses can be specified with some precision. It further assumes that faculty members can and will create a rather structured sequence of activities and measures of performance which students can follow at their own pace, going on to a next phase only after clearly demonstrating achievement of a specific learning phase. It assumes that students will work individually, using a variety of resources such as texts, articles, pictures, television, tapes, and computers, and that the faculty member's role will be that of designer of the sequences, or manager, and will serve as a resource which students will use as needed. There have been a number of demonstrations that such courses can be so organized and that student outcomes can be measured. However, it is significant that the concept has not been widely accepted or utilized by faculty members, other than those few who gained some reputation from having devised such courses.

Return to General Education

By the late 1970's, some institutions attempted to restore some intellectual cohesion to the undergraduate curriculum and to enhance its academic rigor. The Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences approved a new set of graduation requirements which would ensure all students exposure to the major domains of knowledge. Stanford University re-established a Western Culture requirement and insisted that all students take specifically approved courses from each of seven domains of knowledge. The flavor of a number of such attempts at reform is epitomized by a set of proposals advanced by Ernest L. Boyer and Arthur Levine. After an exhaustive review of forty years of curricular activity, they urged, ". . .that all students, from the very first years of formal schooling, learn not only to read and write, but also to read with understanding, write with clarity, and listen and speak effectively. In addition, they should become proficient in the use of numbers, which constitute an essential and universally accepted symbol system, 2) The mastery of these skills is the foundation of common learning. Without them, the goals of general education will be undermined" (Boyer and Levine, 1981, p. 36). They would also require that all students " . . .would look at the origins of institutions: how they evolve, grow oppressive or weak, and sometimes die. It would examine as well, how institutions work, explore the interaction between institutions and individuals, and show how such interaction both facilitates and complicates ... existence." Further, their general education would explore " . . . the significance of work in the lives of individuals and examine how work patterns reflect the values and shape the social climate of a culture. Such a curriculum would ask: What have been the historical, philosophical, religious, and social attitudes toward work around the world. How are notions about work related to social status and human dignity. What determines the different status and rewards we grant to different forms of work. Why is some work highly rewarded, and other work relatively unrewarded" (Ibid, p. 39)?

To them, general education also required ". . . learning about the elegant, underlying patterns of the natural world, and discovering that all elements of nature, in some manner, are related to each other" (Ibid, p. 40). From another domain, they propose ". . .a study of . . .common heritage that would focus on the seminal ideas and events that have decidedly shaped the course of human history. More than a collection of facts, this approach would emphasize the convergence of social, religious, political, economic, and intellectual forces" (Ibid, p. 42). And they wished that all students examine the distinction to be made between beliefs and facts, and how values are formed, transmitted, and revised. They should examine, too, the values currently held in our society, looking at the ways such values are socially enforced, and how societies react to unpopular beliefs. General education should introduce all students to the powerful role of political ideologies, and particularly religion, have played in shaping, throughout history, the convictions of individuals and societies.

This recommended renaissance of the general education ideal of forty years earlier suggested, operationally, that no dogmatically selected courses could be recommended, that general education opportunities in secondary school might contribute, that some of the extra curriculum might be employed for general education purposes, that some off-campus experiences might be included to achieve general education aims, and that general education might be concentrated in asymetrical temporal arrangements, such as the interim term of a 4-1-4 academic calender. The over-all posture of Boyer and Levine is quite similar to programs actually being attempted. They try to steer away from the somewhat inflexible course requirement dominated kind of general education offered during the 1950's, in the hopes that a somewhat more flexible arrangement will prove to be politically feasible. "General education is not a single set of courses. It is a program with a clear objective, one that can be achieved in a variety of ways. And, while there may be great flexibility in the process, it is the clarity of purpose that is crucial" (Ibid, p. 47).

The overall picture of undergraduate education in the early 1980s can be quickly etched. General education seems to be in disarray, with little agreement as to what should be the common elements of an undergraduate program. Academic selectivity and rigorous academic grading seems to be in deline for a variety of reasons, especially the increased competition between institutions for undergraduate students. As requirements were relaxed, students used the greater freedom to strengthen work in a major by using elective options to study deeply some subject related to their major, rather than seeking to broaden their contact with new fields and subjects. The vocational potentialities of undergraduate education increasingly were pondered by undergraduate students, and institutions responded by creating more new programs ostensibly having vocational significance. Virtually none of the major curricular experiments of the 1960s or 1970s became established parts of the mainstream of undergraduate curriculum in the sense that general education did in the 1950s, although many of those experiments seemingly produced positive changes in some institutions.

One might wish that educational research could present evidence relative to the efficacy or lack of efficacy of the variety of reforms attempted following the decline in general education. Ideally there ought to be evidence that attending college produces changes different from the changes which take place in non attenders. It should produce evidence that changes in behavior as a result of life experiences were more or less intense than changes taking place as a result of formal collegiate instruction. Research evidence should indicate the outcomes in student knowledge and behavior of experience in a cluster college was or was not different from students enrolled in an institution without such special sub grouping. Similarly, ideally one might like evidence that some temporal arrangements produce different outcomes than do others and the same question could be raised with respect to off campus experience of college students. In theory a competence based curriculum ought to produce different outcomes than one not so structured and self paced instruction could similarly make a difference.

Unfortunately such evidence is simply not available. Since the early 1950s there has been a major effort throughout the nation to determine the impace of college on students. Beginning with Phillip Jacob's Changing Values in College and culminating in the Feldman and Newcomb, Impact of College on Students, research studies have established that attending college does make some difference. College graduates are somewhat more liberal and tolerant in their outlooks, they possess more knowledge, they seem to exert greater control over the use of their time, they appear to be somewhat less religious and they seem to reflect greater self satisfaction or self acceptance than is true of non college attenders. However, the hundreds of studies of collegiate impact cannot or at least have not established that specific curricular provisions affect those outcomes except for a few gross comparisons which show, for example, that students in a residential setting seem to experience more significant changes than in a non residential situation. This leaves the advocate or opponent of any particular reform with recourse only to assertion or logical deduction. This would be illustrated by the syllogism: many students say they would like to pursue their education in a relatively small group of people. Cluster colleges represent such a small group of people, therefore, cluster colleges represent a viable way of educating students. Or another syllogism might run: students should have off campus experiences in which to test what they have learned in classrooms, overseas experience and cooperative work/study programs present students with such out-of-class experiences. Therefore, overseas experience and cooperative work/study are valid ways of achieving important educational outcomes.

This leads to a different formulation which first involves identifying what is known as to the outcomes of college education. Pace summarized much of this rather succintly ". . .we know that undergraduates acquire a knowledge about a lot of subjects, the more they study a subject, the more theyknow about it. They know most about subjects that are most closely related to their major field; but their knowledge in other fields also increases. Seniors know more than sophomores; juniors know more than freshmen. We know. . .that (college graduates) typically have good jobs and good incomes, like their jobs, think their college experience was relevant and useful in their work, look back on their college years with considerable satisfaction, participate to a considerable extent in a variety of civic and cultural activities, and belief that college contributed to their breadth of knowledge, interpersonal skills, values and critical thinking. We also know . . .that the patterns of graduates activities and interests as adults and the particular benefits which they contribute to their college experience, are generally parallel to the pattern of emphasis of their major and the environment of the college they attended. We also know . . .that college graduates as a group, in all ages and in all periods, more frequently possess knowledge about public affairs, people in the news, geography, history, humanities, sciences and popular culture than do adults who have lesser amounts of schooling" (Pace, 1979, pp. 167-168). In view of knowing those things the curricular question becomes what activities would most likely produce those kinds of outcomes. Pace provides a plausible answer by remarking, "Basically what students learn depends on what they study. They are selective consumers of what is available to them, their selectivity being influenced by their interests and aspirations and seldom are those interests and aspirations totally opposite from what has emerged during 18 years or so of previous developmental history. While college serves to expand knowledge and interest, it also serves to strengthen and deepen them. One clear implication is for colleges to continue doing what they have been doing."

Direction for Reform

A critical question is whether or not there are any generalizations regarding the undergraduate curriculum which could possibly apply to the full range of collegiate institutions extending from the multi-purpose, public, two-year community college to research-oriented universities. There possibly is, provided institutions made a sharper distinction between undergraduate programs leading to an academic degree and other kinds of services an institution might be able to provide. Much confusion concerning the curriculum, especially in the public, two-year community college, stems from an effort to assign academic credit applicable to an academic degree for courses extending from highly remedial courses in writing through highly applied courses in building trades on to academic courses clearly parallel to those offered in four-year institutions. Such a suggestion may seem to run counter to the United States tradition of including a great many sorts of programs within the pale of higher education. Such a tradition has provided great flexibility by allowing students to start a program in Agriculture, then shift to a program in Chemistry, and possibly actually receive a Bachelor's degree in Education, without losing an exorbitant amount of academic credit. Further, the argument is constantly advanced that the historical glory of higher education in the United States has been the embracing over time of many new specialities, such as Agriculture, Home Economics, Engineering, Business, Education, Social Work, Journalism, Pharmacy, Nursing, Police Work, and Theater. If those are appropriate, so the arguement goes, why should not other specialties be added as social needs arise, as, for example, Real Estate, Fashion Modeling, Circus Performing, Jewelry Making, and Life Insurance Salesmanship. One answer would be that such things might definitely be appropriate and that courses in them be worthy of academic credit. However, another response could be that there should be some meaningful distinction between what is collegiate level work leading to academic degrees and other sorts of education, training, or changing behavior. Making such a distinction for operational purposes will obviously rest on informed judgment, just as awarding a Ph.D. degree, in the final analysis, is based on the judgment of other Ph.D.'s that the degree has been earned. It is the trained and legitimated faculty which should express judgments and make decisions regarding courses, programs, and activities. Such judgment, however, if it is not to be susceptible to the charge of capriciousness, should rest on some defensible criteria. Consider a program in carpentry, offered by a community college in cooperation with the carpenters' union, intended to provide workers for an expanding homebuilding industry. In some respects, it might be argued that carpentry does conform to the earlier-stressed emphasis on word, number, and abstract concept. Successful carpentry would seem to require some mathematical awareness, at least some arithmetic and some geometry. There seemingly is a needed technical language with which to discuss problems and solutions. Further, successful carpentry would seem to require an ability to conceptualize a finished project and to understand how details contribute to that concept. In addition, carpentry requires definite manual dexterity, ability to make distinction with respect to woods, tools, and other needed materials, and there are levels of skills proceeding in an hierarchical order from the simple and rudimentary to the complex and sophisticated. In addition, there are ethical elements, such as care for the quality of a finished product. Yet a program in carpentry alone would not be appropriately considered an academic program worthy of an academic degree. A most perplexing question is, why not? The answer must be a relative one. An academic course or program should involve relatively complex theory, relatively sophisticated and complex language, a theoretical base which is expanding and changing, understanding which requires relatively many and complex relationships with other domains of knowledge, and being taught with relatively greater intention of developing broad understandings and relatively less taught to develop highly specific skills. It is conceivable that a program in carpentry could be organized and taught which would conform to the most rigorous canons of academic quality. However, such a program would far transcend the purposes of a carpentry program to develop skilled workers.

A second general observation is that there probably is no ideal pattern of courses or administrative or logistical arrangements, so long as certain broad purposes are sought. There appears no persuasive evidence that a prescribed curriculum, a distributed curriculum, a free elective curriculum, a curriculum consisting of disciplinary courses, or a curriculum consisting of interdisciplinary courses is the best or the worst. There can, of course, be abuses of any of those systems, which would make it ineffective. The impact of undergraduate education seems more related to an aggregate of personal, emotional, and intellectual experiences than to the presence or absence of specific courses or some specific organization of courses. Having said this, it should also be observed that it is probably good that faculties of institutions or subordinate schools, colleges, divisions or departments periodically consider major changes, even thought a significant change would not prove to be demonstrably more effective than that which was replaced. The discussion of change, however, emables faculty members to think and talk about the purposes of undergraduate education, which contributes to the valuable sense of community and stimulates individual reflection on individual educational beliefs and practices. Such a point of view allows one to view with equanimity the typical pre-World War II free elective system or the free elective system modified by distribution requirements, the somewhat prescribed programs of general education after the war, the disciplinary emphasis of the post-Sputnik era, the renewed interest in some form of general education during the late 1970s and early 1980s, and whatever next will be attempted. This is not to say that there should be no order in the undergraduate curriculum or no determining purposes. In way way or another, the undergraduate curriculum should contribute to a common universe of discourse, a broadening of exposure to a variety of intellectual interests, and a rich context of intellectual experiences within which students can obtain some in-depth appreciation of a field or subject.

A third observation is that whatever is attempted curricularly, the provisions should be realistic, with a reasonable chance of achieving its purposes. For example, by the early 1980s, there appeared a growing concern about the foreign language illiteracy of United States citizens which stimulated a demand for restoration of foreign language requirements. For a variety of reasons, these plans appeared unrealistic, such as requiring a year of foreign language instruction. It can be plausibly argued that a year of foreign language instruction taken at the same time that other courses are being studied, cannot possibly develop a sympathy for foreign language, facility with a foreign language, understanding a foreign culture, or making students less ethno-centric. If an institution seriously wanted to restore foreign language instruction, the most likely requirement would be at least three or even four consecutive years of instruction in the same language. It is only by intensive effort that language instruction could achieve its purpose, and the same rationale would apply to the instruction in mathematics, and might even apply to instruction in writing. Reasonable mathematical sophistication would seem to require three or four years of mathematics in high school, followed by two or three years in college. For non-mathematics and non-science majors to attempt to develop mathematical fluency with a one-year course giving a smattering of theory of numbers, a bit of algebra, a bit of calculus, and a brief exposure to statistics, will simply not suffice. If collegiate institutions acted consistently with the ideals of developing verbal, mathematical, and conceptual sophistication by requiring a realistic exposure to those matters (assuming the validity of the ideal), there could well be a side-effect of reducing college enrollments, an event that would not be without considerable value.

Any discussion of undergraduate curriculum must take a position on several pervasive and perplexing issues. The first of these is the question as to what should consititute Associate or Bachelor's degress in arts and sciences. As a result of many forces and developments those academic degrees have been readily obtainable through virtually any advocate of courses and experiences which any one institution will accept. This laissez-faire attitude toward the meaning of an academic degree evolved over 300 years with such landmark decisions as requiring Latin alone in place of the previously required Greek, Latin and Hebrew, elimination of curricular prescription, allowing modern languages to be substituted for classical languages, and the gradual elimination of foreign languages, mathematics and English requirements, and finally making requirements whatever an individual student had done or wanted to do. That situation should be reversed with institutions and other concerned agencies insisting upon at least some structure to a program leading to an academic degree. One possible structure which could be used for either an Associate degree or a Bachelor's degree would be to divide the curriculum into four approximately equal parts. Those parts would be a major or a concentration which could be either a concentration in an academic discipline or in collegiate level vocational and professional courses. A second form of the undergraduate curriculum would be contextual courses to help provide students with perspective for their major, so that contextual courses for a nursing curriculum might well be Biology, Physiology, and Chemistry. For engineers contextual courses might be Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry.

A third force would consist of basic courses providing college skills and insights judged essential for anyone receiving an academic degree. These basic requirements would probably include such things as English, History, Mathematics and whatever else a faculty judged to be essential. The last force might be described as liberalizing or broadening subjects which students would elect in order to broaden their intellectual outlook. Now if the courses which could be counted in any of those four segments met the criteria advanced earlier as to what was collegiate level work, a clear concern for academic quality would be expressed but without some of the rigidities found in the past. Such a structure would force faculties to think about the curriculum in terms of student need, vocational goals and program balance, but would not expect them to do more than their training and traditions allowed. Such a structure, by requiring four different sorts of couse experience, would prevent technical, vocational or professional curriculum from being overly specialized and technical to the exclusion of other important educational values. The structure is a way of responding to the frequently made charge that the new vocationalism will bring an end to the liberal arts and sciences. The problem is not collegiate offering vocational preparation. Colleges and universities have always done that from the preparation of bureaucractics in medieval church and government to the preparation of social workers. The problem has been that the lack of a few controls has allowed technical and vocational programs to deteriorate with respect to academic and intellectual quality.

Insisting upon applying criteria as to what is and is not collegiate level work and insisting that an academic degree curriculum manifest a balance between different kinds of courses, however, still does not deal with some educational activities in which different sorts of institutions wish to engage. Land grant colleges offer short courses in Agriculture, and university extension offices frequently offer a wide variety of short courses, seminars, conferences and colloquim. Community junior colleges offer courses in auto mechanics, welding, photography, and recreational sports. There can really be no quarrel with institutions undertaking such kinds of activities so long as they can finance them, there is student demand, and they do not contribute credits for academic degrees.

As is true of so many issues discussed in this book, the publicly supported community-junior college provides an important special case. As noted in Chapter I such institutions provide many desirable services in technical vocational work, adult education and community services. The perplexity arises when those activities are equated with activities designed to lead to an Associate degree, and for some, ultimately a Bachelor's degree. Thus far community-junior college leadership has resisted making a sharp distinction between courses appropriate for college transfer and all other things the institution does. That reluctance will continue, especially if continuation yields important financial dividends. One can still argue, however, that a distinction should be made. One possible solution might be to create within community-junior colleges a separate unit which would offer only collegiate level college parallel courses. Such a unit might be labeled "the college" and it might have its own faculty for whom there would be different expectations such as the expectation that faculty members in the college would be expected to do some research and scholarship as part of the professional role.

Chapter IV

Organized Out-of-Class Life

Virtually every study of the impact of college on students underscores the out-of-class collection of experiences as being the most potent educational force affecting student development. This being so, some attention must be paid to the various out-of-class organizations and services which contribute to that powerful out-of-class impact. These, in organized form, have been called, variously: student-personel activities, student services, or out-of-class life services. Whatever the name, and however organized, these activities typically include: counseling, student activities, discipline, special services, and student government; sometimes they also include admissions, health service, financial aid, placement, remedial clinics, and even intercollegiate athletics.

It should be pointed out that the out-of-class life of students can be divided into that life which just happens and that which is organized by the institution and that each can be enormously important to student development. As students interact with each other in the context of an educational environment they develop a number of skills and beliefs essential for adult living as well as for academic survival. Skills of inter sexual relationships, courtship, sexual behavior and most recently of cohabitational living are still, for the most part developed, not in classes and clinics, but through more informal means. Skills of study and academic survival, including academic gamesmanship, are probably more frequently learned informally from peers than from faculty and counselors. Voluntary organization such as Greek letter societies are frequently the shapers and formers of attitudes and values both of a positive or of a negative sort.

A fraternity can produce considerable social competence or anti social behavior as an episode at Stanford illustrates. The Zeta Psi fraternity on that campus had produced generation after generation of students who deviated from normally accepted standands of behavior. In the opinion of faculty groups which reviewed an incident which led to termination of the chapter on campus, the traditions of the Stanford chapter of Zeta Psi socialized students toward a lack of regard for property and the rights of others.

It also seems likely that many of the skills needed to cope with the educational bureaucracy are also developed most effectively through peers. Getting a loan, or selecting courses, are learned informally. However important as these matters are, the focus of this chapter will be on organized services and activities.

Organized student activities began, as did so many other developments in higher education, at the end of the Civil War, when higher education entered its century of explosive growth. Prior to the Civil War, when institutions were typically quite small, presidents and faculties assumed full responsibility for the total life of students in their custody. As institutions began to grow, and as faculties became professionalized with respect to their academic disciplines, other agencies were required to administer the proliferating range of collegiate activities taking place outside the classroom. Thus, there emerged deans of men, deans of women, directors of admissions, resident hall advisors, and directors of intramural athletics. The expansion of such positions slowed considerably during the Depression of the 1930s, when institutions could not support activities which generated little or no tuition or appropriation income. However, at the end of World War II came an enormous expansion of what was called the student-personnel movement. This expansion included a generation of theorists searching for a rationale to accommodate the diversity of activities, graduate training programs to produce appropriate practitioners, and claims by student-personnel professionals of responsibility for virtually every activity on campus, excepting classroom work, financial affairs, and supervision of the physical plant.

The proliferation of activities stemmed directly from post-World War II needs and conditions. Veterans needed counseling and advising, which led to counseling centers. Students needed housing, as enrollments grew beyond the absorption capacity of local communities. Increasingly heterogeneous student bodies produced a need for remedial services. The influx of foreign students produced the need for appropriate supporting services. Expanding enrollment pressures generated a need for more systematic admissions techniques. And an emergent philosophy expressed a point of view demanding growth. This point of view ". . .imposes upon educational institutions the obligation to consider the student as a whole--his intellectual capacity and achievement, his emotional make-up, his physical condition, his social relationships, his vocational aptitudes and skills, his moral and religious values, his economic resources, and his aesthetic appreciations. It puts emphasis, in brief, upon the development of the student as a person, rather than upon his intellectual training alone" (Delworth et al., 1981, p. 26).

The zenith of the student-personnel movement was reached during the 1950's with theorists claiming responsibility for an enormous range of activities activities. The services listed were as follows:

1. Interpreting institutional objectives and opportunities to prospective students and their parents and to workers in secondary education

2. Selecting and admitting students, in cooperation with secondary schools

3. Orienting the student to his educational environment

4. Providing a diagnostic service to help the student discover his abilities, aptitudes, and objectives

5. Assisting the student throughout his college residency to determine upon his courses of instruction in light of his past achievements, vocational and personal interests, and diagnositc findings.

6. Enlisting the active cooperation of the family of the student in the interest of his educational accomplishment

7. Assisting the student to reach his maximum effectiveness through clarification of his purposes, improvement of study methods, speech habits, personal appearance, manners, and so on and through progression in religious, emotional, social development, and other nonacademic personal and group relationships.

8. Assisting the student to clarify his occupational aims and his educational plans in relation to them

9. Determining the physical and mental health status of the student, providing appropriate remedial health measures, supervising the health of students, and controlling environmental health factors

10. Providing and supervising an adequate housing program for students

11. Providing and supervising an adequate food service for students

12. Supervising, evaluating, and developing the extracurricular activities of students

13. Supervising, evaluating, and developing the social life and interests of students

14 Supervising, evaluating, and developing the religious life and interests of students

15. Assembling and making available information to be used in improvement of instruction and in making the curriculum more flexible

16. Coordinating the financial aid and part-time employment of students and assisting the student who needs it to obtain such help

17. Keeping a cumulative record of information about the student and making it available to the proper persons

18. Administering student discipline to the end that the individual will be strengthened and the welfare of the group preserved

19. Maintaining student group morale by evaluating, understanding, and developing student mores

20. Assisting the student to find appropriate employment when he leaves the institution

21. Articulating college and vocational experience

22. Keeping the student continuously and adequately informed of the educational opportunities and services available to him

23. Carrying on studies designed to evaluate and improve these functions and services

24 Fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living

25 Expansion of programs for international understanding and cooperation

26 Application of creative thinking to the solution of social problems and to the admininstration of public affairs (Delworth, 1980, pp.26-28).

No sooner had that zenith been reached, when decline set in. In response to new conditions, student demand for freedom and the lowering of the legal age of adults to eighteen eliminated much of the discipline and adult supervison of students' lives. The success of the professorial-academic revolution ensured the hegemony of academic affairs on campus, and a diminishing of resources and respect for non-academic matters. "In the eyes of many student services professionals, the functions they perform are too often valued by trustees, administrators, and faculty as a somewhat distant second to the primary functions of teaching, research, and service. They sometimes feel that others perceive them engaging in a nebulous array of vaguely supportive activities, or performing expensive babysitting, which, at best, keeps potentially troublesome students quietly occupied, and, at worst, provides the opportunities for fomenting trouble through such outlets as inflamatory student newspaper articles or invitations to highly controversial figures to speak on campus" (Delworth, 1981, p. 47).

By the 1980's, there were two extreme positions or viewpoints regarding student affairs on campus. The first was a reaffirmation of the rationalistic views of Robert M. Hutchins, the former president of the University of Chicago. He saw no need for faculty members to waste time on improving the conduct and the health of students. He believed, "Undoubtedly, fine associations, fine buildings, green grass, good food and exercise are excellent things for anybody. You will note that they are exactly what is advertised by every resort hotel." He rejected the need to educate the whole person, believing that education was the single-minded pursuit of intellectual virtues. At the opposite extreme stood the radical egalitarians, who demanded an ever-expanding range of student services, especially those needed by new college students seen as flocking to campuses. Followers of Hutchins reject everything save the intellectual, and followers of the egalitarians embrace everything, even at the expense of the intellectual. This chapter will seek some possible middle ground.

It should be observed that there are two major sorts of student services, only one of which is controversial and impinges on qualitative questions. The first are the purely administrative or custodial services, including record-keeping, providing food and lodging, and maintaining a reasonable level of orderly conduct on campus. The second sort are those services presumedly of educational significance, either through removing barriers to the achievement of educational goals, or positively contributing to educational outcomes. The former would include health services, counseling services and remedial services, while the latter would include living arrangements for educational purposes and student organizations similarly designed to facilitate achievement of clearly educational objectives.

Before attempting a critique of various student services, several transcendant issues should be explored, because how they are resolved will have direct impact on the kind of services institutions should provide. The first issue which is all too frequently ignored in the advocacy literature regarding educational services, is the matter of establishing priorities in the face of finite financial resources. No one can seriously dispute the potential values of teaching adults to read, of counseling individuals regarding sexual problems, of providing free lectures and concerts, of publishing a campus newspaper, of providing free day-care centers for children of college-attending mothers, of offering counseling services regarding death and dying, or of providing students with a variety of role models, including authors, dancers, painters, or successful, mature women in residence. Yet institutions with finite resources could not do some things of importance if it attempted to provide those desired services. Given the sobering significance of computers as intellectual tools for problem solving, which should have higher collegiate institutional priority--establishing a network of computer terminals so that all students may learn to use the computer as aids in coursework problem-solving, or a network of individuals responsible for training students in inter-personal relationships? Both are probably desirable, but at some time the question of appropriate priorities for a collegiate institution must be faced.

Related to the broad issue of priorities, is the issue of what kinds of service, and how intensive, should be provided various special groups of students. A defensible case can be made that some college students have intellectual deficiencies, which, if they were removed, could allow students to cope with academic work. Deficiencies in reading, writing, mathematics, and study skills can, within reason, be rationalized by a college or university. However, the question should be asked, is there a limit to intensity of effort beyond which responsibility for removal transcends the appropriateness of expenditure of institutional funds. Put another way, should there be some limit as to how much effort an institution should expend for individual students. It can likely be demonstrated that four years of remedial reading can help some students survive who would not do so were the help not available. There are some students having distinct psychological problems, who could be helped to persevere to a bachelor's degree, if they had the support of a therapy session once a week, throughout all the years of an undergraduate career. During the 1950's, Michigan State University maintained remedial clinics for reading, writing, speaking, and arithmetic. Some students demonstrating deficiencies were assigned to those clinics, although not all who reflected need could be accommodated. An examination of the impact of those clinics suggested that they helped students stay in school a little bit longer, but did not seem to increase graduation rates. A writing clinic, for example, appeared as a crutch, which helped students pass courses, while they were participating in the clinic. Cessation of participation (removal of the crutch) seemed to be followed by academic failure and dropping out of school. The policy issue for Michigan State University could be sharply stated: to ensure academic survival of deficient students, should remediation be provided as long as necessary, even though that might mean reduction in resources for academic and research activities?

Once again some comment about non-traditional education for new kinds of students is in order. A series of rhetorical questions can bring issues into focus. Should a collegiate institution (either two- or four-year), at public expense: employ counselors to help prison inmates overcome rage and hostility, in order to cope better with academic work; provide periodic home visits to a physically incapacitated seventy-year-old woman, to assist her in her academic work; assign counselors to go into remote areas of a state to organize a support-group of students, and meet with them regularly to discuss with others their own problems, goals, hopes, and fears -- an effort especially designed for students lacking the emotional stamina to do academic work on their own; or to provide a bookmobile to bring library holdings to many isolated communities. As is true for a myriad other services, there can be little dispute as to the social worth of such activities. The question is, are those services the responsibility of a collegiate educational institution, and if so, what kind.

Another sort of issue is how much service should professionals provide students and how much should students be encouraged to provide themselves, if they so desire. During the expansionist period of the student-personnel movement, there appeared an implicit assumption that as needs arose, services should be made available. Thus we see a plethora of advisors for student government, sponsors for clubs, leaders for Black residence halls, survival counselors for Black students in engineering programs, directors of centers for women's affairs, veterans' counselors, and counselors for problems related to draft registration. Another point of view is at least somewhat tenable. That point of view, early expressed by a nineteenth-century president of Harvard, Charles Elliot, held that students should be almost completely free to make whatever decisions they wished to make, and would be expected to provide or not provide whatever services they wished. Thus, if students wished, they could organize student government, persuade faculty members to sponsor activities, organize, within limits, their own living arrangements, and recruit their own campus speakers. In this connection, it can be argued that exercising freedom to succeed or fail is educationally potent and valuable.

Underlying such issues, and other similar ones, is the fundamental question as to the essential purpose or purposes of a collegiate institution. If one accepts the arguments of developmental psychologists such as Arthur Chickering, one has a rationale urging institutions deliberately to offer an almost infinite array of services. Chickering argued that the central task of college students was establshing identity through developing confidence, managing emotion, developing autonomy, freeing interpersonal relationships, clarifying purpose, and developing integrity (in Delworth, 1981, p. 86). In Chickering's thought, each of those elements are specific objectives which require explicit effort on the part of the collegiate institution striving for development of the whole student. Other theorists also have proposed additional dimensions, which if sought in practice, would consume enormous resources. A different point of view was exemplified by the University of Illinois in the 1930s. The University maintained a dean of students largely responsible for discipline, a housing office largely responsible for certifying housing quality, an intramural athletic staff largely responsible for providing athletic equipment, and modest academic advising for those in academic difficulty, provided by the offices of the deans of the several schools and colleges. There was a student union, run by students; a campus newspaper, run by students; various religious centers, run by denominations; and a large collection of fraternities and sororities, run, typically without supervision, by students, which provided considerable student housing, along with the privately-owned rooming houses and two small University-operated residence halls, for three hundred women students. While more service was provided in some of the smaller, privately-supported institutions, especially those affiliated with religious denominations, a general pattern prevailed in American higher education which stressed formal programs for intellectual and professional development, but left most other matters to students themselves. The question must be asked, and answered, whether conditions had changed so much by the 1980s that that laissez-faire approach no longer was valid. It can, of course, be argued that the radically increased heterogeneity of college student bodies, the reduced socializing effectiveness of the church and the small-town community, the propensity of American families after World War II to move quite frequently, and the change in secondary schools, from being college-preparatory to comprehensive service stations, all force collegiate institutions to assume new responsibilities. However, there can still be the question as to how many new responsibilities colleges and universitites legitimately can fulfill, and still meet their historical objectives.

Of the wide variety of student services which are provided students, or for which claims are made that they should be provided (child day-care centers), for example, the most relevant and promising for matters of educational quality are academic advising and orientation to college life and academic affairs. Whether one adopts a developmental theory or a straight empirical approach of asking students and former students what they need most, the opportunity to talk with a mature adult about concerns emerges as a strong correlate of success in college. In the 1950s, Jacobs remarked that except for a few institutions, most colleges and universities had little impact on students. Those few included quite diverse curricular arrangements (from pure instrumentalism to pure rationalism). The one thing they had in common was deliberate provision for sustained and intimate advising, to such a degree that whenever a student needed adult support, it was there.

Even highly intelligent and motivated high school graduates really neither seem to know what they really want out of college, nor how they can exploit the cultural and intellectual riches even modest colleges offer. They typically are searching for some adult to whom they can go for advice or support comparable to their parents'. The academic advisor can provide that service.

As to how advising should be provided, there are a variety of approaches, some appropriate for one type of institution or faculty, but not for others. For those institutions with relatively weak faculties such as community colleges, state colleges, and the smaller liberal arts colleges, making advising a part of a teacher's contract for all full-time faculty members and having them to do the job is a possibility. At Stephens College (then a junior college), during the period of its greatest influence (1928-1968) all teachers and professional administrators were expected to advise a proportionate share of the total student body. All were trained through advising seminars and an advising handbook and all were required to see advisees at least six times in an academic year. It was this sytem which most enabled the institution to attract a national student body to a rather uncomfortable, Mid-western town thirty-five miles from the nearest trunk railroad, and to graduate well over 70% of its entering students with 65% of that same group obtaining bachelor's degrees after graduation. This contrasts with the graduation rates in public junior colleges of under 20% and a rate for obtaining a bachelor's degree of under 10% in the 1970s. By such standards as SAT scores of students, Stephens was not selective, but its advising provided an essential service which produced good results.

Finding a solution is more difficult in research universities and prestige colleges, whose faculties see their discipline and their research and scholarship as their most important activities and being available to undergraduate students an unwarranted drain on their time. A pluralistic approach would seem workable which would include departmental responsibility for advising declared majors, investing considerable resources in advising publications, involving faculty in living units when possible, and creating opportunities for intense advising for at least some students through such devices as over-seas campuses or residence halls devoted to a single interest such as language houses. If institutions willing to invest enough resources in such efforts and to insure diligent coordination, most of the advising needs for most undergraduate students could be provided.

Greater attention to orientation to an academic institution also deserves more attention. As a general rule, residential institutions could well provide up to a week of rather intensive orientation for freshman students. During that period, a great deal of attention would be given to skills needed for academic survival, wise selection of academic programs, learning about advising resources, and, of course, provision for social life and recreation. Commuting institutions, of course, cannot mount such an intensive effort, but can, with imagination, organize orientation programs for at least several days, which should be well worthwhile. During a two-day orientation, there would be time for some personal advising and a reasonable variety of group activities to acquaint students with the academic nature of the institution which could lead logically to the selection of a program at the time of registration.

A variation available for some institutions to help some students would be summer orientation programs of perhaps five days for each of perhaps six to eight different groups of students. Students would come to campus on Sunday and leave Friday afternoon. During those five days, a variety of activities could be undertaken, however, the greater emphasis should be on academic careers, academic choices, and academic survival.

These sound like such simple suggestions that one might wonder why stress them. The reason, of course, is that all too frequently, especially in large institutions, the significance of orientation has not been sufficiently recognized to warrant a major demonstrative effort. Orientation stresses the social, recreational, or the bureaucratic, and not the academic and intellectual. Of all the possible uses of resources for student services, it can be urged that creating a well-organized orientation program leading directly into a consistent and intensive advising effort would likely produce greater student retention and better academic performance than any other combination of activities. The evidence in support of this observation is only indicative, and far from conclusive. Michigan State University found that students who participated in a week-long summer orientation program out achieved those who did not participate, and graduated at significantly higher rates. Keuka College in up state New York cut its attrition rates in half when it instituted an advising system which stressed academic survival skills for freshmen.

This point deserves elaboration. Even high school students committed almost from birth to attend college appears to have little understanding of what college is all about, what programs are available, what the realistic requirements are for various professions and locations, and especially how to work independently which the reduced number of classes in college as contrasted with those in high school seems to require. Asking only that new students appear at a scheduled time for registration, is quite simply asking students to make grievous errors in selection of courses which in aggregate should comprise a realistic program. However, if those same students can be provided with several days of intensive instruction about such matters the likelihood of wise choices will be enhanced. If every student has one professional person to whom he or she can go as questions arise after school starts still more chance for survival is provided.

A related activity is remediation for academic and intellectual deficiencies. There can be no doubt that many students enroll in college unable to read, write, study, or calculate effectively, and that if an institution accepts them it may have a moral obligation to help them rectify their deficiencies. However, two matters should be faced. The first of these is whether or not deeply embedded intellectual deficiencies perhaps eighteen years in the making can be overcome reasonably quickly and whether or not a collegiate institution should use its resources for the sustained remediation needed to overcome deeply rooted problems. It would appear sensible that reasonably able high school graduates having had moderate academic success might read too slowly, have poor study skills, write in infelicitous ways, or need some refresher work in mathematics, and that those problems could be alleviated by ten to fifteen weeks of remediation. Almost all first-year law students at Stanford find that a writing course helps them with their academic work. Institutions both large and small which are reasonably secure financially might well create remedial programs in at least reading, writing, study, and mathematics for perhaps the 10 to 15% of their entering freshman class who needed them. It might assume that remedial effort in some skills might require a term or a semester. If that did not suffice, and students could not cope with a normal academic program, the assumption might be made that they really did not belong in that institution.

Sometimes a somewhat longer remedial period might be appropriate, as in the situation of southern Black students enrolling in an engineering program but lacking the skills needed to cope with mathematics and the hard basic sciences and also lacking role models of Blacks who had become engineers. For such students, a two-year program might be created which would include considerable advising, especially organized courses in mathematics and hard sciences, an opportunity to earn money through cooperative work, and an opportunity to meet and come to know Black engineers. Such a program has been offered by the University of Houston and apparently has reduced Black attrition rates and increased grade point averages. However, even in such a situation, in the absences of external sustaining funds, one or two years at the most should be allowed. If at the end of two years there are students still unable to cope, they should be terminated from the program and advised to consider alternatives.

The essential message advanced here is based on the belief that the basic academic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are, for the most part, developed over a long time, and that a fundamental deficiency in any of them in an 18-22 year-old is not likely to be removed in an relatively short time, such as an academic year or two. For the truly deficient, say reading at the fourth or fifth grade level, institutions and individuals would be both well served to part ways. What remediation can do is to build on a basic skills foundation to improve such things as speed of reading, increased retention, better paragraph construction or review of basic arithmatic rules and procedures once having been mastered but forgotten. It is that sort of objective which would make remedial seminars a legitimate collegiate activity, which in the long run contributes to academic quality.

Once again the issue of academic credit must be faced. Many public junior colleges in addition to the traditional college level freshman course in composition, rhetoric or communications offer a variety of other English courses, including some seeking to develop just rudimentary understanding of simple English usage. Regardless of the level, ranging from courses which do little more than help students distinguish between "there and their," to courses requiring sophisticated composition academic credit is equally awarded. The argument is advanced that if academic credit were not awarded the marginal students requiring such basic instruction would probably not attend the junior college and even if they did could not obtain fianancial aid. In addition, public junior colleges are reliant on public funds appropriated on the basis of enrollment in courses carrying academic credit, hence are eager to maximize those enrollments even if that means granting academic credit for some courses offering work at little more than the fifth grade level. There can really be only one intellectually honest answer to that problem. A college or university should differentiate between collegiate level courses and those below that level, and award credit only for those courses which meet collegiate standards. If students are so unmotivated to attend college that they will try to rectify serious intellectual deficiencies only if that effort is rewarded with academic credit, they very likely will not persevere to completion of a program anyway and should be allowed to really find other avenues to maturation and development into adulthood. Colleges occupying such a precarious existence as to require for survival awarding academic credit for significantly below collegiate level work probably should not exist as a college. Institutions might well continue to exist with other aims or other missions but not as a college or university.

A similar point of view can be taken with respect to such other barriers to academic performance as physical or mental health. College medical service can be justified solely to take care of medical emergencies or to refer students to appropriate medical services. For the public two-year commuting college this is probably the best arrangement. Residential institutions may feel the need for additional service on campus to provide some hospital care for students, as well as some limited, outpatient care. The rationale for such service is clear -- the removal of relatively superficial barriers to academic performance. Helping students to get over the flu enables them to get back to their primary task, as does administering flu shots. But the college or university is not a clinic which can legitimately provide care for the chronically ill. Most institutions cannot provide major medical services. For these, students should be expected to seek outside help, paid for typically through health insurance. It is true that a few institutions do provide intensive health services, as does Stanford University or the University of California, Berkeley. Stanford can offer full clinical services because it is private and because it believes that it can better help remove barriers to academic work on campus, rather than sending students elsewhere. The University of California, Berkeley, is in a more difficult situation, since it is a public institution in a state which does not provide such elaborate services to students in the state colleges and community colleges. Berkeley will argue that it uses non state funds for health services and certainly will continue to offer them. Institutions not deeply into providing health services should enter only in limited ways.

Similarly, psychological counseling can help remove such barriers as anxiety of fear of taking tests or inability to concentrate. Professional counselors can help sensitize faculty with respect to problems of mental health. These efforts can be warranted as contributing to academic quality. Long-term therapy, however, does not seem appropriate, even though at the end of four years of counseling a disturbed student might be better able to cope with academic work. Students needing such deep treatment should, for the most part, not be deemed an institutional responsibility. Of course, a counseling center which trains counselors could accept limited numbers of calls requiring intensive treatment for the purpose of giving counseling interns needed clinical experience.

A word is appropriate here as to the use of counseling centers to sensitize all parts of the campus community to the various problems of mental health. Warnath strongly endorses this activity, arguing that a better mental health climate can thus be achieved and that this contributes to the achievement of academic goals and objectives. However, too much should not be expected from such an effort because of previously argued reasons. College faculty members are professionals only with respect to the subjects they teach. Over time, some may develop some psychological sophistication and may help some students to overcome problems. But to expect professors of French, Physics, or Engineering to take on some of the attributes of a clinician is to be unrealistic. Life on campus would probably be better if all professors could be trained in a few counseling techniques, such as the ability to listen, non-evaluative attitudes, and sensitivity to problems which transcend their knowledge or experience, but the cost of trying to ensure that condition is likely too high for the benefits obtained.

It is also necessary to address the very real counseling needs of the many new types of students who for one reason or another have begun to enter collegiate institutions. These would include marriage counseling, counseling to support quite elderly people seeking to earn an academic degree, counseling to help cope with the death of a spouse, dealing with Social Security problems or adjusting to retirement, new careers counseling for servicemen or -women planning for early retirement or counseling prison inmates enrolled in academic programs, and who are about to be released. The same advice should be followed -- counseling service is warranted only to facilitate academic progress through dealing with relatively superficial barriers. Beyond those, collegiate counseling should be most circumspect.

One of the major activities in the student services domain which developed from the end of World War II has involved residence halls. The activities included serving as resident hall advisors, organizing resident hall student government, planning resident hall social and cultural activities and participating with faculty to create a new entity called residential education. The use of residence halls as centers for learning and living reached its zenith with the creation of cluster colleges, house plans, and experimental residential colleges. These were intended to be relatively small groups providing primary group support for students and to bring learning and living into a natural balance. For some students, these worked, at least for a time. But the concept never was adapted into the mainstream of higher education practice for at least two major reasons. Most residence halls were not designed for such purposes and neither a majority of faculty or of students really enbraced the idea as something they wanted to do. In addition there is the argument that in adult life the normal pattern is to live in one situation and to work in another. Trying to unite living and work in college in a sense may be unnatural.

There are a number of examples of residence halls making a direct contribution to academic life -- foreign language houses to facilitate use of another language and ethnic houses to provide psychological support for minority group members. For the most part, in both large and small institutions, residence halls were what they are -- places where students eat, sleep, and study. Residence halls may be starkly plain, or may provide a variety of comforts and amenities. On an average, residence halls will consist of relatively small rooms housing two or more students, some recreational and eating facilities, and bringing together students who may or may not come to associate with each other and enrich each others' lives.

While residence halls may or may not provide organized programs of lectures, intramural athletics, social affairs, or formal arrangements with faculty members, they do, for the most part, make the enormous contribution of bringing together groups of students of approximately the same age, who in quite an informal way can and do educate each other. Various theorists, including Woodrow Wilson, when President of Princeton, have pointed this out. The first essential for a college education is a residence hall, a college could be effective with just that. If other resources became available, a library might be built, followed by recruiting faculty. Only when those were in place and functioning should an institution consider building classrooms. One might add to that aphorism a note that after classrooms might come elaborate programs of residence hall activities organized by resident staffs and other student services officers.

There are a range of activities which more properly should be called campus services, rather than student services, and which are intended to enrich the social, cultural, and intellectual tone of a collegiate campus. These would include a campus union, lecture-concert series, traveling displays of art, extramural lectures and seminars, visiting scholars, painters, poets, or singers in residence, and celebrating special events through artistic or intellectual statements of various sorts. Some of these activities have become so important that it has been observed that collegiate campuses have collectively become the major empresario of the arts in the United States. Such events have had a long history deriving from debates, sermons, and declamations of early nineteenth-century colleges.

There is a clear logic to support a variety of such activities. They can contribute to the civility of a campus, can break the monotony of academic life, provide students with varied role models, and bring intellectual content to the campus which otherwise might require specialized, and expensive, academic courses and programs. While there is no good way of determining the actual impact of those events on members of the campus community, intuition suggests that they do make positive differences in the quality of campus life and should be given reasonable support.

Only a few observations about such events need be made. Obviously cost is a factor, and only a small proportion of institutional funds can be used with the bulk of expense provided by individual payments. A variety of events, each attracting small numbers of people, is probably better than a few block buster events demanding large attendance. Planning and organizing events for the most part is better done by small, decentralized campus groups, such as departments, than by a centralized officer. While some events have a legitimate institutional development pupose -- big time football does attract attention of legislators and potential donors, and some events can be offered as a service to the larger community, still, the primary qualification is, in the final analysis, contribution to student development, especially cultural and intellectual development. It would be better, for example, for a public community college to schedule many of its events during the day, when there might be a reasonable chance of attracting students, than at night, when chiefly members of the community would attend. In the early years of the University of South Florida, one hour each day was cleared of all classes and formal academic activities so that events could be scheduled before the typical three o'clock exodus from the campus. This particular set of recommendations is based upon a belief as to the essential values of a college or university and that those are best achieved in small groups.

First among the attributes is a climate in which ideas are believed to be important in and of themselves. Obviously, ideas which will lead to action of some sort are not to be discouraged. A university is an instrument of society which trains people in the skills of a vocation, of citizenship and of the arts of successful living as determined by that society. The university will, of course, assume that many ideas are of worth simply because of their relevance for their practical purposes. However, a university should also foster another attitude toward ideas. It should be a place where the abstract refinement of a concept is accepted of as great worth as building a house or auditing a set of books. Further, the university should possess a tone in which students and faculty feel a desire to invent, explore and discuss ideas, nor should the source of ideas be primarily verbal. Ideas first expressed in sound, color or in line are to be valued as well as those exposed through verbal or quantitative symbols. In addition, ideas need not all be of "high seriousness." The campus should not make people ashamed of the pursuit of the light and fanciful any more than it should discourage pondering of questions on the nature of man and of the significance of justice. The notions from a Steinberg cartoon may have as appropriate a place in the collegiate environment as the massive interpretations of God by a Buber or a Maritain.

Second, the campus should provide conditions and should sponsor a spirit in which leisure is enjoyed and respected. It is not the goal of a university to keep its students and faculty at assigned work all of the available time. For that matter, to attempt to do so would be foolishly impossible. Rather, the university should accept leisure as an essential in the lives of people and should provide ways for its creative use. One can contrast a desirable use of leisure with simple time-killing or with filling leisure hours with activities which anesthetize people to the reality of experience. The unviersity would not reject television, nor consumption of food and drink, nor complete idleness. Indeed, these can each be used appropriately as leisure time activities. It would, however, seek to have its students and faculty select wisely from the many leisure time activities and enjoy them as complete and worthwhile experiences. This is a difficult concept to express and even more difficult to achieve. One can contrast the individual who spends hours before the television screen simply to pass the time before some other scheduled activity and one who watches a comedy hour because he enjoys humor. Similarly the use of alcohol as a means of dulling one's response to reality can be contrasted with the consumption of beer because beer tastes good and doubly so when shared with someone who also likes the flavor of the drink. Participation in sports simply to expend enough energy to allow one to sleep can be contrasted with participation in games for the sheer joy of feeling one's body respond to the challenges of the game.

Third, the university should create a climate in which academic work is viewed as of essential value rather than as a tedious means to some pragmatic end. Again the university does not reject its purpose to prepare its students to do the many things which they and society need. The university should help students keep in mind the need to become effective teachers, skilled draftsmen or accurate accountants. However, if such ends are the chief motivating forces in the academic program, the university may be successful but will not be a great nor a vibrant institution. In some way the sheer aesthetic pleasure of working a statistics problem or the complete personal involvement in preparing a research paper should be cultivated. Again this abstraction perhaps can be clarified by examples. The course in Functional English which is generally regarded as chiefly a hurdle to overcome on the road to a degree or as preparation in skills needed in other courses would be less consistent with the ideal than the same course viewed as a tough, demanding but nevertheless pleasurable experience in itself. Perhaps pleasure is the wrong word. Courses may prove vexing to students but if accomplishement of long, hard assignments is viewed as a worthy purpose, the ideal will have been in part realized.

Fourth, the university should be pervaded by a spirit which encourages people to accept the uncertainties of not knowing how things will come out. The spirit of the frontier, where there are many difficulties, where the possibility of failure always is present and where the human emotions are always taxed, is the one which is sought. Human beings are always faced with uncertainties and these are never comfortable. They can respond by seeking to find some more clearly understood way or they can develop a toughness of character which allows them to live with not knowing how the story will end. It is the latter, almost stoical ideal, which should characterize the university. To make this concept more specific the university should be a place in which students and faculty can see their most vital beliefs scrutinized and still not flinch. It should be a place in which change of vocational plans is regarded as simply one other uncertainty with which people must live. It should be a place in which theory can be pushed to the furthest limits of human comprehension without driving students to infantile compensations for the tension of not knowing. The university should be a place in which teacher or student can ask "Why?" until it forces the other to the basic presupposition upon which all belief rests.

Fifth, the university should be a place in which intellectual and creative effort is valued for itself. It should foster the belief that the artist should be more than tolerated. The artist should be encouraged to pursue efforts even though the resultant abstractions seem to distort traditional concepts of beauty and even though the effort seems to profit no one, not even the artist. It should encourage students to investigate the most esoteric subjects if those subjects seem to have genuine appeal for the student. In short, the university should encourage students to value the experience of creative effort and to value a similar quest by others. This obviously is no easy prescription. To accept the endless theorizing about personality structure when this has little relevance to how people seem actually to behave is difficult. To encourage a college sophomore to delve into religious questions which have perplexed centuries of theologians may seem a waste of time. To allow students to proceed down alleys the professor has already learned were blind calls for a high faith in creative effort. Yet all of these must be obtained if the goal of a vigorously alive collegiate enterprise is to be even approximated.

Sixth, the university should be a place in which both cognition and affection are viewed as effective and valuable forces. It should not be preoccupied with conscious reason alone. It should accept and teach its students to respect feeling as a worthy means of human response as well as rationality. It should be possible for students and teachers to become angry with each other. It should accept as good the expressions of sheer joy which can come from a pleasant afternoon at a football game. It should accept the feelings of uncertainty with which students see basic religious beliefs challenged by the findings of science even when this involves tears. The university should be acceptant of emotional responses to modern poetry whether those are of like or bitter dislike. However, it should also encourage its students to use reason and feeling as tests for their respective validities.

Lastly, the university should be a place which makes a significant difference in the lives of its members. Whether one likes or dislikes the particular outcomes of the institution is relatively unimportant in this regard. What is significant is that students and the community should be distinctively different simply because the university exists. By this we do not mean solely the increased purchasing power which a university education brings, nor the increase in numbers of persons from the region listed in Who's Who in America. We do not even mean that students should more uniformly accept the beliefs of their professors or that the larger community should be a macrocosmic version of the university. We do mean that both students and the community should be more willing to consider ideation, to enjoy leisure, to accept academic effort, to encourage creativity, to communicate with each other more freely and to accept the uncertainties of not knowing. If we can even approach this ideal we shall indeed have achieved our purpose for being.

As an over-arching point of view regarding student services, laissez-faire has much to commend itself. Undergraduate students are emerging adults seeking to develop, each in unique ways, but with needs in common as well. What institutions can best do, after providing the necessary services of housing when appropriate, food, record keeping, emergency medical care, and ensuring that reasonably competent advising is available to all, is to provide as rich an array of activities and services as resources and demand allow, to be used as students themselves see fit. This point of view is different both from the student services doctrines of the 1950s, with its stress on the planned development of the whole student, and the radical egalitarianism of the 1970s, with its intent to meet whatever need any given student felt should be satisfied. It says that institutions have limited resources, and limited competence, and that the resources should be used to do those things which a college or university does best -- intellectual development - but, at the same time, allowing student development along other dimensions.

While each institution will set its own priorities as to services and activities provided, some appear to be essential for all. These would include, in order of significance and importance: academic advising, limited remedial services, counseling, career planning and placement, intramural athletics, opportunities for students to form primary group associations, and a reasonably elaborate variety of interesting events and activities. If institutions have the resources, beyond what is essential for their primary mission, they might also provide full health coverage, overseas campuses, specialized living arrangements (foreign language centers), campus ombudsmen, artists or scholars in residence, married student housing, and some form of religious counseling. Other services, while of potential value, are too far removed from central collegiate purpose to warrant institutional support and administration, although students could provide or obtain those services for themselves. These would include specialized counseling (marriage, sex, draft, personal fiances, trauma, etc.), services specifically organized to serve non-campus constituencies, and those services, sustained over time, to accommodate serious deficiencies such as home visits to the seriously disabled, or individualized instructional systems needed over a long period.

Chapter V

Faculty -- A Peculiar Breed

Contributions to Quality

There can be little question that over time, college and university faculties have contributed to the strengthening of academic and intellectual quality. Although the initiative typically came from administrative leadership, nonetheless, faculties in the late 1940's and '50s enacted graduation requirements designed to ensure that all students were at least exposed to the major domains of human knowledge. In research universities, faculty members produced such a volume of significant research that, for a time, the United States became the research capitol of the world, contributing to the technological triumphs of World War II and the medical, aero-dynamics, and space triumphs during the 1950's and '60s. This flowering of research in many fields led to curricular enrichment as new courses and programs, such as Southeast-Asian art, statistical-based history, genetics, and computer science were added to college catalogs. By serving on test advisory committees, faculty members ensured that the various national testing programs reflected that curricular enrichment. The growth patterns of institutions such as Stanford, Carleton and Dartmouth, which emerged during the late 1950's and '60s as highly selective, pace-setting institutions, reveals that the first and most important step was the wholesale recruitment of stronger and stronger faculties. During the two rapid growth periods of the veteran era, 1945-52, and the 1960's, faculties generally were able to accomodate large numbers of students without serious dilution of the quality of faculties, as indicated by the possession of the doctorate or terminal degree. Cartter remarks that data ". . .suggested that the percentage of professors with the doctorate had increased in each four-year interval, for each type of senior institution" from 1950-51 to 1962-63 (Cartter, 1976, p. 17). There can be little doubt that faculties have contributed in some measure to the overall success of higher education in the '50s, '60s, and '70s.

In making those contributions faculties obtained a variety of benefits and perogatives generally deemed to be essential for sustained improvement of collegiate educational quality. First of all, the financial conditions of the professoriate improved substantially between 1958 and 1970. Prior to '58 the real purchasing power of the professoriate declined as compared with other professions and indeed declined to an approximation of 1939 levels. Beginning in 1958 faculty salaries began to increase at about 7% a year significantly ahead of rates of inflation and the consumer price index. These rates continued so that by 1970 faculty salaries had, across the country, doubled over their 1958 levels. These salary increases were accompanied by decreases in numbers of courses taught and student-faculty ratios. Before World War II, normal teaching loads in junior colleges and many liberal arts colleges ranged between 15 and 21 hours a week taught in the form of five or six different courses in a semester or quarter. In major state universities teaching loads for senior full professors typically ran between three and four different courses each semester or quarter and not infrequently ran to as many as five courses, some of which were graduate and the majority large undergraduate courses. During the 1960s, however, course loads dropped in the essentially teaching institutions to three or four courses, and in the universities to one or two courses. This decline in actual course contact was justified on the ground that faculty members needed more time for research and scholarship and for preparation for courses. Additionally, fringe benefits for faculty were steadily improved from a reasonably typical package of social security, some form of retirement plan, Blue Cross medical insurance, and occasionally a term life insurance policy to the condition of the 1970s of fringe benefits being valued at from 15 to 20% of salary (tax exempt) and included catastrophic illness, health insurance, dental insurance, insurance for disability income, children and spouses tuition assistance, assistance in obtaining housing, and a number of other small, but important benefits.

Further the educational and research resources available to faculties improved as library holdings were increased, better and more complex laboratory equipment was installed, educational technology such as language laboratories were created, office space was expanded, and as computers became significant, growing amounts of computer time were provided faculty members. While some institutions were not able to improve the lot of faculty members, in most situations the professional life of faculty members became a desirable one with relatively light fact-to-face teaching loads, adequate needed equipment, long summer vacations with typical opportunities to earn additional income by teaching summer school, sabbatical leaves and increased subsidy for professional travel. Although clearly describing a minority, Bendiner described the ideal for the professoriate by pointing out that, "In the large front rank universities, teaching, at least to undergraduates, has all too clearly been losing ground as a major concern, and the higher a man's standing, the less he has to do with students. For four or five decades university teaching as such has had to contend increasingly with the competitive attraction of research and writing . . . but more recently, with the flood of grants and contracts from government and foundations, the movement of teachers from classroom and lecture halls has become a stampede. When in addition, the professor finds himself wooed by steel manufacturers ready to pay $500 a day for his advice on metalurgic shortcuts; when South American universities beg his guidance in setting up schools of economics and Asian principalities look to him to train their policemen; when professional organizations sponsored by generous foundations invite him to conferences in Crete or the Vale of Kashmir, all expenses paid, it is not surprising that lecturing to freshman should have lost much of its appeal" (Bendiner, 1962, pp. 14-15).

However, a paradox emerged. The general improvement in the condition of the professor in all types of institutions appeared to have been accompanied, especially by the latter part of the '60s, by moderate to serious decline in quality especially as concerned the educational mission of collegiate institutions.

Contriubtion to Decline of Quality

Beginning in about 1970, faculties, faculty members, and faculty policies contributed to either deterioration of quality or no significant improvement. First, in spite of a great deal of exhortation and the crescendoing availability of knowledge about teaching and technologies with which to do it, there has been really no shift in the prevailing mode of college teaching. During the 1940s, the prevailing mode was lecture, lecture discussion, or lecture laboratory, and that mode did not materially change by the late 1970s. Ebel, after visiting a variety of institutions, could remark, that, "Class sizes do vary from the small school to the large universities, and, to some degree, discussions do have a better chance at the small school, but in small schools and large, a student can count on spending a great deal of time listening to his professors." And he further observed that, he had ". . .strong reservations about the effectiveness of the lecture method" (Ebel, 1972, p. 5). The constancy of method is well illustrated by the 1938 course on Browning at the University of Illinois, taught by lecture to several hundred students in the Lincoln Hall lecture room. The professor droned to his remarks while students slept, read newspapers, wrote letters, gazed at the walls, or read textbooks in preparation for another class. The same scenario was found in 1975 in an anthropology course offered in the same lecture hall to a similar number of students. The only perceivable difference was that in 1975 the lecturer wore a throat microphone, which produced, instead of the earlier drone, whistles, screeches, and scratches.

Curricular Irresponsibility

A major faculty contribution to academic deterioration, although often accompanied by claims of strengthening quality, was the gradual elimination of graduation requirements, designed to ensure undergraduates with a core of liberal education. It is true that faculty members had approved strengthening such requirements earlier, but were generally restive regarding the results. As quickly as possible, throughout the '60s dismantling of general education took place. At Stanford, requirements were virtually eliminated because a research-oriented faculty and graduate or professional school-bound students wanted nothing to stand in the way of increased specialization of academic work. In the University of South Florida, in the 1970s, the highly-structured College of Basic Studies was eliminated, and responsibility for undergraduate general education assigned to increasingly specialized disciplinary departments, with the obvious result of elimination of requirements which did not contribute to greater and greater student specialization in their majors. It should be noted that faculties continued to discuss the purposes of undergraduate education in liberal terms reminiscent of earlier times, but typically could not reach the hard decisions as to what should be required, given the new tensions of the 1960s and 1970s.

Grade Inflation

There can be no doubt that faculty members individually and collectively contributed to academic grade inflation during the late 1960's and 1970's, and, once again, they did so for a variety of overt and covert reasons. It should be pointed out that earlier grading systems were far from perfect, and that examples of unreliable and invalid grading could be found in almost any institution. Yet, the existence of a well-defined grading system did serve as a strong motivation for students to take academic work seriously. McKeachie clearly established the rationale by declaring grades to be the most important motivational device: "Whatever a student's motivation for being in college, grades are important to him if he is genuinely interested in learning, grades represent an expert's appraisal of his success; if he is interested in getting into professional school, good grades will unlock graduate school doors; if he wants to play football, grades are necessary to maintain eligibility. Most students are motivated to get passing grades, and thus grades are a powerful motivational tool for teachers" (McKeachie, 1963, p. 1119). And Baker and associates indicate how that motivation works: "Because they think grades so important, students want them to be awarded in a way that is both fair and serious.

To return to our monetary analogy, it is as though they wanted to be paid a fair wage for their work, in currency that has real value, recognized by others in the community, and paid according to some impersonal set of rules, rather than being subject to an employer's arbitrary whims. When a professor violates any of these expectations, students complain" (Baker, et al, 1968, p. 114).

Abdication of Governance Responsibility

In theory and in mythology, faculty members have been responsible for the academic qualities of institutions. Through corporate decisions of faculties, curricular content is established and standards created. Yet, the substantial majority of college faculties do not participate in the academic governance procedures by which academic decisions are made. McConnell, for example, estimates that in two large California institutions not more than 18% of the total faculty were on more than one board or committee for a five-year period. There appears to be in most institutions a relatively small oligarchy of faculty members who serve in senates and on committees and who, essentially, make the major institutional decisions. Now, in practice, this arrangement may be satisfactory. However, it does preclude from active decision-making the variety of opinion which would be found in the total faculty. It is possible to theorize that wider expression of opinion might produce a substantially different academic emphasis than generated by the small number of oligarchs who do, indeed, rule. It should be noted, however, that perhaps this is not a bad situation and that general faculty participation would produce an unholy mess.

Part-Time Faculty

There are several varieties of the use of part-time or differently prepared faculty which may have qualitative consequences. First, there is the use of part-time faculty members in on-campus situations who are appropriately prepared, but who spend only limited time on campus to meet their classes and to hold brief office hours to advise students. Their courses may be of high quality, and professionally given, but their contacts with students so superficial and formal as to deny the student growth which requires rather continuous interaction. Or, an institution offering off-campus programs, such as on military bases, may use their own qualified faculty to conduct evening classes, perhaps meeting once a week. Institutions may, as does Nova University, staff their off-campus programs with highly-qualified national lecturers, who hold full-time appointments elsewhwere, and who meet their far-flung classes once a month for a period of four and five hours. In both of those situations there is no questioning the qualifications of faculty, but there can be a serious question as to whether those instructors can spend the time needed for significant changes to take place in their students. Increasingly, institutions are establishing off-campus courses and programs, with faculty members who are not reviewed as rigorously as are on-campus, regular faculty members, and whose qualifications may be questioned. Thus, a resident director of an off-campus program will seek faculties whose preparation is somewhat related to the program he needs, but that relevance, all too frequently, being only marginally so. A local businessman might be recruited to teach principles of economics, or a local school superintendent recruited to teach educational organizational theory. There is also a growing tendency, both on and off-campus institutions to employ as part-time to teach special courses, local lawyers, tax-accoutants, medical doctors, or sales people, who may have had considerable, and even distinguished, experiences as practitioners, but which does not necessarily equip them to engage in such a complicated phenomenon as education.

Here exists a paradox which must be faced. College and university full-time faculty members are assigned relatively light working-loads in the form of meeting classes (four to twelve hours per week) and on the assumption that teaching those classes is a highly professional activity, requiring a great deal of preparation, and requiring considerable additional professional effort outside of class to produce desired results. Full-time faculty members contend that they spend fifty and sixty hours per week of professional work, whether they are teaching in a research university or in a public junior college. It is also assumed that professors become better in what they do over time and that this improvement in quality is rewarded by promotions, increases in salaries, and, periodically, sabbatical leaves, designed to improve still further academic performance. It is often also urgued that education is a labor-intensive industry, for which mass production methods are inappropriate, and that the intensitivity is generated by the professional nature of the college teacher's role. If those assumptions and claims are warranted (and, certainly, both institutions and faculty organizations act as though they were), how can the use of the local trial lawyer teaching a one-night-a-week course in American jurisprudence be justified? The practice of a trial law is undoubtedly a complicated activity in which lawyers might be expected to improve through experience, but there can be serious question that that experience also contributes to educational sophistication.

Not to believe that college and university teaching is a highly professional activity, is to undermine the bases for faculty prerogatives. Thus, leadership of public two-year community and junior colleges claim educational superiority for those institutions, since faculty members are not distorting their primary teaching responsibilities by research publication. Implicit in such claims is the assumption that faculty members will continuously improve their teaching abilities and course organizations. One wonders how such a claim and assumptions be reconciled with staffing policies producing as many as two-thirds of a faculty being part-time and not prepared in education or an academic field. If full-time college teaching is not a demanding professional role, all instruction could be economically more efficiently provided by part-time faculties holding other jobs. If full-time college teaching is professionally demanding, then the widespread use of part-time, itinerent faculty cannot be justified.

An Aging Faculty

There is one potentially damaging condition which can as yet not be established as fact. That is, the likelihood of an aging faculty, especially in those institutions having a high percentage (70% or more) on permanent tenure, will create few opportunities to make new, younger appointments. There is some fear that as faculties age, their physical and intellectual energies decline, with attendent qualitative loss to their institutions. This situation is seen as worsening as the age of mandatory retirement for tenured professors is increased to age 70. Although an aging faculty might not decline intellectually, it is true that openings for younger professors, it is to be hoped with new ideas, are decidely limited and will be more so during the latter part of the 1980s and 1990s. To the extent that institutional growth requires a constant flow of new ideas and knowledge, institutional quality seems likely to suffer.

Declining Critical Mass

A last qualitative decline with respect to faculty happens most frequently in the relatively small, tuition-driven private institutions, but it could conceivably happen in tax-supported ones, as well. That is, when the institution must make major cuts in faculty to avoid financial ruin. Many liberal-arts colleges had prospered and offered reasonably rich programs during the 1960's with a student-faculty ratio of ten or twelve to one. When financial adversity became pronounced, institutions moved that ratio upward to thirteen or fifteen to one, with scarcely discernable ill-effects. They were able to offer reasonable curricula with courses offered by reasonably qualified faculty. However, when financial problems forced still higher student-faculty ratios, academic integrity fell into jeopardy. A liberal-arts college of 800 students with a twelve-to-one ratio, could have sixty-six faculty members, a number large enough to offer a rather varied program. When enrollments dropped to 600, and the institution went to fifteen to one, forty positions could be derived. If enrollments dropped to 500, and the institution, compelled to go to nineteen to one, only twenty-six faculty members would be available. In several extreme situations, faculties purporting to offer a broad program in liberal arts and sciences have been reduced to ten or twelve full-time faculty members, plus a few, transient part-time faculty, certainly not enough to accomplish the mission claimed.

However there is a darker side. It might well be that the very nature of the professoriate is such that not much change with respect to the elements of decline in quality can be expected. First, there is the popular perception of professors, which is extremely paradoxical. As compared to other professions, including business and politics, the professoriate seems to have high regard. However, when novelists write about college and university professors, a perception is presented so extreme as to appear to be a caricature. Professors are seen as lacking grace, charm, and humor. They are overly preoccupied with meaningless abstractions, and are frequently seen as being mean and vicious in their personal relations. Their family lives are viewed as typically being humdrum, interspersed periodically with sordid little sexual encounters with students or with spouses of other professors.

Faculty characteristics, exposed by more systematic inquiry, however, also reveal a not too promising image. Jencks and Riesman observe that teaching is not a profession, and that there is no guild within which successful teaching leads to greater prestige and influence than mediocre teaching, nor any professional training that develops pedagogic skills, in a systematic way. They argue, further, that it is hardly surprising that a great deal of teaching is dull and ineffective, and that if teaching happens to be good, it is chiefly a matter of luck and fundamental temperament. Those who lack a natural flair probably never improve because they lack the insights to improve, and their colleagues typically offer no assistance or support.

The American college or university theoretically provides an ideal setting for professors to be intellectuals. It provides a milieu in which people can share the common concern with the pursuit of knowledge. It provides professors regular remuneration and security of tenure. It provides a great academic freedom to be exercised in large amounts of time freed for intellectual work. Yet, in the way institutions operate, they may tend to force professors toward anti-intellectualism rather than toward intellectualism. The promotion process encourages rapid publication of typically inconsequential material, rather than spending considerable time striving to make a major intellectual contribution. It has been remarked that Immanual Kant would not have survived the American system because he published nothing of consequence until age 57. Then, too, American academics spend their professional lives in tightly constrained departments, with little opportunity to interact easily and frequently with others in different fields, and each of these departments establish rather fixed standards, to which all who would succeed must conform. The intellectual free spirit may not be welcome in departments. In major research universities, faculty members are frequently led away from intellectualism by the quest for consultantships and the search for research grants. The grant system affects adversely senior professors who must find grants and administer them, and also penalizes junior faculty whose financial security depends on the annual renewal of the project providing support. The relevant question is, of course, whether it is possible to expect reforming tendencies from those who seem to be moved inexorably toward anti-intellectualism.

A major element of faculty character is that in many different ways, college and university faculty members are marginal individuals. Marginal individuals are people who feel themselves different from others, unable or unwilling to join important reference groups, and experiencing rather consistent feelings of threat, anxiety, dread, and anger. Academics tend to associate socially and professionally only with other academics, and tend to feel unconfortable with different groups of people. They testify they would not feel at home in most sections of the middle class. As one remarked, "If I go home to the old neighborhood, I run out of things to say and do with my old buddies. They tend to talk about the stock market." Professors seem to feel that the business community views college teachers as fuzzy liberals or communists, who don't do any work and are impractical. Academics see themselves as not really playing an important role in shaping the course of events, and as not being taken seriously by people in power, except for a few token individuals, such as Bundy or Kissinger.

Mayhew, from a different vantage point, also reached the conclusion that many academics are marginal: "Some, with lower-class backgrounds, use intelligence and education to move into the higher classes of society. As college professors, they have many of the attributes of the higher classes but still do not make important social, economic or political decisions. College professors, even when in demand as consultants to business and government, are still not of the power elite. Other professors develop marginal status feelings in different ways. A former high-school teacher, now in a junior college, wants to be considered a real college professor but lacks the full credentials, the publication record, and even the freedom to create courses patterned on his own interests. Professors who teach teachers at state colleges, which are converted to comprehensive universities, also become marginal. A catalog tells them that they are university professors, and that research and graduate education are important, but they possess neither the skills nor the interest to engage in such activities. The result is that these feelings of insecurity and anxiety which professors seek to relieve through striking out at the system or organizing to defeat it. The most fertile fields for unionization are junior colleges and state colleges in transition, which have a high proportion of faculty who are desperately trying to leave the high-school or teacher's college category, but without success" (Mayhew, 1970, p. 69).

Faculty marginality reflected in a sense of alienation from the dominant establishment culture, identified with business and materialistic values, always strong, could be reinforced during the 1980s as a result of the financial squeeze and the disproportionate weight in institutional affairs of those faculty who entered the professoriate during the 1960s. The decline in financial support has led many toward militant unionism, and to engage in militant political action to safeguard their interests. Ladd and Lipset remark that, "Class or vocational interests in the late 1970's may, therefore, enhance the traditional adversary culture associated with higher education. One may even identify in this process a counter-cyclical trend in the academic community, whereby the more conservatively-inclined teacher segment at less research-involved schools, takes on socially critical views in harmony with their support for militant unionism. The initially more liberal views of the younger faculty, reflecting the dominant orientations of the period when they entered the profession, the 1960's, may be reinforced, rather than moderated, as these faculty suffer frustrations imposed by a declining labor market and scarce financial resources" (Ladd and Lipset, 1975, p. 404).

A different complement of academic personality, highly related to educational matters, is how people become college professors. One thing seems certain; that relatively few young people decide they want to become professors in the way other young people decide early that they wish to become doctors, lawyers, or businessmen. When quite young, the future college professor became interested in some solitary activity, such as rock or butterfly collecting, or experimenting with a chemistry set, or a telescope.

As they grew up, they gained more and more satisfaction from such activities, and grew more and more isolated from their peers. As undergraduates in college, they achieved their greatest satisfaction from delving more and more deeply into their major, without giving particular thought to the time of graduation and the need to find employment. At graduation, entering graduate school was seen as a way of continuing such pleasurable activity. And then, as the graduate program progressed, going into college teaching appeared as a highly likely choice which would allow further engagement with what interested them, and which would provide at least a modest livelihood. In a very real sense, the young college teacher agreed to teach courses and to provide some administrative services in exchange for the opportunity to continue working or dabbling in history, English literature, philosophy, chemistry, or biology. It is true that many who enter the professoriate in time come to enjoy teaching and contact with young people. They tend, almost invariably, to perceive themselves as historians or biologists, rather than teachers or members of a helping profession. This self-perception is suggested by the fact that few academics read very much of the expanding literature about higher education and its processes. There are almost 700,000 professors in the United States. The number reading books about higher education or joining associations concerned with processes of higher education must be judged as relatively few. Jossey-Bass, by 1980, had become the major publisher of professional books in higher education, with typical sales ranging between 2-5,000 copies. The American Association for Higher Education claims to be a major spokesperson for the problems and processes of higher education, yet has fewer than 8,000 members, with participation in its widely publicised annual conference being about 2,000. As one former English professor, lately become a dean, remarked, she had led a comfortable and happy professional life never being aware of Change magazine, the Chronicle of Higher Education, or books about college teaching, college curricula, or college administration, and she was not sure she enjoyed the new acquaintance.

It should be underscored that American higher education is a pronounced status system, affecting the aspirations and self-identities of those who participate in it. In general, the high status institutions which provided the highest salaries and the greatest freedom to professors were the prestige research universities, and prestige colleges (mostly private) whose faculties were quite similar, even though institutions might differ in size. These institutions maintained light teaching loads, and emphasized research and scholarship as the most appropriate activity of the professoriate. Next came rather large, comprehensive institutions seeking to become members of the elite and emulating the practices of the elite. These were followed by regional universities, many private universities located in municipal situations, followed by state colleges and former state teachers' colleges, followed by relatively small, invisible private liberal-arts colleges, followed by two-year institutions, both public and private. Faculty behavior and prerogatives in the elite institutions became the norm toward which faculty members in lower-level institutions wished to move, either by moving themselves into the next higher tier, helping convert their institutions upwardly, or gaining for themselves the prerogatives of the elite faculties. Several difficulties arise from this status system, with the most important being that different types of institutions do have quite different missions, which attract quite different kinds of students. Faculty members, instead of identifying with unique institutional missions, seem to identify with the highest status roles, which may be antithetical to lower level institutions, and seeing the light teaching loads in elite institutions, demand the same for themselves, although lacking the talents or temperment for research and scholarship insisted upon in elite institutions. In many lower-level institutions, faculties appear to try to emulate elite faculties, but in ways which turn out to be a caricature rather than faithful imitation. This phenomenon may be clearly seen with the creation of Michigan State University - Oakland, which was to be a commuting institution catering to the vocational aspirations of young people of the region who typically came from non-college attending backgrounds and traditions. The first faculty consisted of relatively young scholars from Ivy-League institutions, who wanted to imitate in Oakland the traditions they had experienced as undergraduates and graduate students. That faculty proposed requiring all students to learn either Russian or French, would not offer any mathematics below calculus, and would offer no remedial or "bone-head" English composition in the Freshman year. "Every student was to take a required curriculum of university courses, consisting of two year-long courses in Western institutions and in Western literature in the Freshman year, a year in non-Western studies, a year of science and mathematics, a four-semester sequence in social science, plus a foreign language, and one term of music or art" (Riesman, et al, 1970, p. 31). The faculty seemed to have assumed that the freshman would have come from high-prestige and demanding high schools, which would have prepared them for such a rigorous curriculum. Instead, most freshmen had attended secondary schools of no particular distinction, and, even in those had ranked below the top 20% of their graduating classes. The attempt to transplant elite values and style to a non-elite institution produced immediate chaos when the faculty gave failing grades to three-quarters of the students at the end of the semester. Gradually, the faculty was forced to modify or else see the institution go out of business, because students refused to attend. One can at least theorize that high attrition-rates in non-elite institutions might, in part, be related to faculty styles patterned after elite faculties which were ill-suited to the kinds of students who enrolled.

It is extraordinarily dangerous to generalize about faculty characteristics in such a diverse system, which includes open-admissions two-year colleges, provincial private liberal-arts colletes, normal schools turned state colleges or universities, massive flag-ship state universities, and highly elite private universities, possessing resources of a billion dollars or more. Generalization becomes even more hazardous in view of the rising tide of part-time faculty, many of which draw on vocational experience, rather than academic preparation for legitimacy to teach. Nevertheless, for at least the full-time, tenure-track college or university teacher in two-year, four-year and graduate institutions, some common charateristics can be noted having relevance for affecting academic and intellectual quality. There is a common view of life proceeded by the socialization of graduate schools attended, whether the individual earned a master's degree before joining the faculty of a public junior college, or a Ph.D. degree before becoming an assistant professor in an Ivy-League research university. Although the considerable majority of those earning advanced degrees will never engage in serious research and scholarship leading to publications, nonetheless, graduate students typically internalize the ideal of the graduate faculty member to whom disciplinary research is the highest form of acadmic activity. The community college instructor, the liberal-arts college professor, the state university professor, and the academic stars of prestige departments in comprehensive universities will all expect teaching-loads which allow time for research and will use disciplinary integrity as a criterion for judging institutional and curricular issues.

Given these complex and frequently contradictory characteristics it can be seen how faculty members may have contributed to decline in academic quality. As marginal individuals, faculty members may be typically susceptible to a strong need to be liked, hence when students turned on faculties and their institutions during the late 1960's, faculty members may have given into student demand by inflating grades, reducing requirements and acceding to student desires for courses having relevance. At the same time this general marginality may have contributed to the striving for the appearances and prerogatives of professors in elite institutions on the part of professors in the non-elite institutions. The syllogism for the professor in an invisible liberal arts college or the instructor in a public community college might run as follows: Faculty members in elite institutions are recognized and rewarded for avoiding heavy teaching responsibilities, I aspire to be like those individuals, therefore I should avoid or neglect serious educational concerns and activities.

Before addressing possible ways by which faculties might be encouraged to reassert a variety of concerns with academic and intellectual quality the positive and negative conditions needed for academic quality should be reiterated. Quality is likely to be jeoparadized when faculty members are superficially prepared in the subjects they teach and rely primarily on adult experiences to comprise course substance. Appropriate academic preparation must rest on a large and complex body of interrelated information, a large and equally complex range of generalizations interpreting the meaning of that information, still another large and complex series of interrelated but unanswered questions regarding additional information and a range of ways to uncover answers to those questions. Sophisticated insight into such matters requires that professors have steeped themselves deeply in whatever subject they purport to profess, thus a professor of school administration should not be expected to teach a specialized course in school law even though the professor might have some awareness of legal issues and principles. A professor of entomology should not be expected to teach a course on human sexuality before spending three or four years intensively preparing to do so. If institutional leadership could be persuaded to follow a simple but enormously dangerous rule of requiring intensive professorial preparation before allowing courses to be offered, the chances for qualitative enhancement would be significantly improved.

Academic and intellectual quality would most likely be enhanced when a number of intensively prepared professors continue, over time, to deepen their understanding of subjects they teach, offer a series of courses interrelated according to some explicitely stated logic or rational which are intended in aggregate to develop student knowledge, understanding of that knowledge and ability to apply that knowledge.

Improving Faculty Quality

Improving faculty quality can in part be enhanced through administrative leadership. Presidents, deans, or departmental heads can try to recruit only prepared faculty, and stimulate curriculum change and decreasing grade inflation. Faculties can be encouraged to modify and improve a limited range of teaching practices. Administration can review the use of part-time faculty and take steps to improve the quality of part-time appointments. Organizational arrangements can be created to facilitate faculty participation in governance. The various processes of faculty affairs can be improved and made more sophisticated. Better search procedures, review procedures for promotion and tenure decisions, clearer statements of faculty rights, responsibilities, and conditions of work and more precise methods of insuring accountability can be developed based on growing experience with such matters.

Further, several general attitudes can be urged. The first of these would be to cast the image of professors in a human, rather than in a romantic or an heroic, mold. Faculty members are reasonably intelligent human beings who have learned to do some things reasonably well, who possess, from time to time, traits which can hurt or help development of students, but should not be seen as paragons of virtue. It may be that criticism of faculties is so easy because ideal images of faculties have been so exalted. Thus, faculty members have been described as the agency through which divinity touches the soul and spirit of the young. They have been portrayed as the shapers of character whose influence on youth will last a lifetime. They have been proclaimed as ideal role models of the examined life and the personification of humanistic virtues. The radical egalitarian reformers see faculty members as so flexible and talented that they can quickly develop all of the techniques and approaches of most of the helping professions. And professors frequently claim for themselves the role of critic of society and all too frequently are accorded that role by elements of the larger society.

Of course, such claims are nonsense. Professors are people who have learned a great deal about something, which the history of mankind suggests is important to know, and which can contribute to the development of youth. Historians, linguists, and philosophers are professors because of a traditional belief that history, language, and philosophy are important things to know. As long as that belief is warranted, the major way to improve the quality of faculty is to encourage them to learn more and more about their subjects and to become more and more competent in expressing it to students.

Institutions properly should be concerned that faculty members develop, mature, and improve, and the institution should facilitate that improvement. Such emphasis should be placed on only the relevant traits of scholarship, abilitity to communicate, teaching, and what might be called academic good citizenship. Those matters can and should be evaluated in a variety of ways and those evaluations linked to positive and negative sanctions. To expect more from faculty generally is to expect the impossible and really to violate the social contract which from the twelfth century on has governed what professors do to earn social support and approval. If some professors like to participate in residence hall activities, entertain students in their homes, counsel students about personal matters, organize informal discussions, involve themselves in campus concerns with controversey, march with student protestors, or become personal friends with individual students, those are their own affairs, as is also true for those who do not do those things.

Faculty Characteristics

The role of a college or university faculty member is a peculiar blend of the ideal and the mundane. The ideal side is implied by the kind of lives faculty members may lead.

Among the joys is the sheer fact of the campus as a desirable place to work. Wherever it is located, the college campus reflects a preoccupation with the best of human experience. There is the pleasure of the teacher in working with young people on the threshold of discovering self and the importance of ideas. And to faculty members, ideas themselves govern the pattern of their lives. Members of the college community offer one another the opportunity and stimulation of discussing an idea, not necessarily for any practical end, but for the worth of the idea itself. They are like-minded men and women in a good sense of that phrase.

Then there is the matter of self-direction. A young scholar characteristically will survey a subject and decide on what part he or she will concentrate on for research and teaching. The student will also decide when one line of inquiry has been exhausted and when he or she should shift. Self-regulation of such high order requires personal security. Colleges and universities can't guarantee inner tranquility, but they do set the best possible conditions within which it might be achieved.

Throughout life everyone is evaluated and performance is judged. Part of the pleasure of the collegiate career is that professors are evaluated by their peers and colleagues and not, as is usual in most vocations, by a superior whose judgment they may suspect. Although disciplinary loyalty so cultivated may dilute institutional loyalties, the main result is a net benefit accruing to the higher learning.

Among the woes is that, after all, college teaching is a job, and jobs have their dull sides as well as their bright ones. For every bright and promising student encountered professors will meet dozens who seem concerned only with obtaining a degree with the least amount of work possible. Progress up the academic ladder is slow, and the wait for full professional recognition and promotion may seem interminable, more the result of campus politics than demonstrated ability.

Academic life is in many ways more tension-producing than most other callings. Scholarship and teaching -- each is similar to acting. One's entire personality is on public display and even the most secure feel uneasy that their best efforts will not be enough. Another bother is the load of administration and committee work -- schedules, budgets, equipment, faculty promotions, and all the rest -- necessary functions, yet destructive of the hours available to classes and research. The professor is in many ways a solitary sort of person who chafes under the strictures of administrative regulation, but those are facts of academic life.

When the joys and woes are put in balance, when the institutional and disciplinary loyalties are reconciled, and when the recent changes in academic life have been taken into account, a balanced perspective can be presented.

The life of a college professor is a comfortable one, yet for most it is not likely to be an affluent one. It is true that some professors receive quite handsome rewards from salaries, consulting fees, and book royalties, but most receive incomes typical of middle-class America. The life of a college professor is relatively secure from such dangers as loss of job and loss of income because of illness. But this security is essential to allow for the personal freedom to perform effectively in daily teaching and research. The professional life is filled with books, ideas, and stimulating colleagues. He has a well-established role in society. Yet, it demands many more hours of work than do some careers if the teacher is to feel himself professionally fulfilled and respected by his peers.

The life of the college professor can be exciting. It provides the opportunity to deal with the frontiers of knowledge, to consult with government and industry, and to help students understand the forces creating an age. Yet, it is a quiet life in many ways. The pace of fall faculty meetings, classes meeting several times a week, and hours spent in a library, laboratory, or study make for a tempo different from the physician's ceaseless round of hospital rooms and patients or an industrialist's hectic schedule of appointments.

CHAPTER VI

College Teaching: A Limited Instrument

The essential academic outcomes of higher education are produced through subtle but powerful interaction of a limited number of activities. Collegiate institutions themselves represent one of these elements by symbolizing through structures and artifacts desired goals, and facilitating achievement of them through appropriately designed space and facilities. A second and perhaps most important element are students themselves, who, coming from varied backgrounds, nonetheless seek common goals and who aid and reinforce each other in that quest. The third element is the curriculum or the collection of courses which provide students in some organized form those items of knowledge which have been judged through tradition and through explicit decision as likely to contribute to students' intellectual development. A fourth element is a collection of services and amenities specifically designed to facilitate students' coping with curriculum and helping them overcome some kinds of barriers to intellectual development. The fifth factor is the faculty which consists of a number of individuals possessing knowledge and skills, most frequently, conveyed to students through the act of teaching typically in situations involving a single teacher and a group of students. In a sense, the relative influence of each of these components depends on the relative quality of other factors in the equation. Thus, in a small residential college, having facilities which allow groups of students to interact with each other intimately and for extended periods of time, there is likely less need for many sophisticated services because peers themselves can in proper situations serve each other with respect to such matters as understanding the bureaucracy and developing skills needed to survive academic requirements. In institutions catering to commuting students less reliance can be placed on students and more reliance placed on formal service arrangements. In institutions having large numbers of highly talented, experienced and insightful professors a formal rigorously organized curriculum is far less necessary than in institutions having, for the most part, faculty members of mediocre talents and limited experience, and in the romantically idealistic vision of Mark Hopkins sitting at one end of a log and a student on the other, no formal curriculum would be needed. The great one hundred year old chemistry professor at the University of California at Berkeley, Joe Hildebrand, frequently criticized formal general education requirements offered to freshmen and sophomores intended to acquaint them with the broad domains of knowledge of the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and communicative skills. Hildebrand argued that students should be taught the details of discipline first, which if properly mastered, would allow them eventually to perceive the inter-connections between domains of knowledge. Such theory would undoubtedly work well if every teacher of those details possessed the breadth of interest and perception which Professor Hildebrand daily demonstrated. Unfortunately, there are not many professors possessing the consumate wisdom and insight of Hildebrand and for the majority of common or garden variety professors, greater reliance must be placed on the formal curriculum. In some respects, this phenomenon may be illustrated with two historical episodes. It is probably significant that a tightly prescribed curriculum was the rule in American colleges during the 17th, 18th, and early 19th centuries, when teachers, for the most part were relatively young and without a high degree of academic preparation. The prescribed curriculum began to deteriorate as the formal qualifications of faculty members began to improve during the decades after the Civil War. A second appearance of a prescribed curriculum in the form of quite specific general education courses enjoyed its most rapid growth between 1945 to the mid-1950's. This was a period of large veteran enrollments and a scarcity of academically well-qualified faculty to teach them. Given a situation in which a majority of faculty appointed to cope with the veteran enrollment possessed typically only a Master's degree, and substantial numbers only a Bachelor's degree, a carefully structured curriculum seemed necessary. That type of structured curriculum began to deteriorate almost simultaneously with the increases in numbers of new faculty members having been well-trained in graduate school and having received the Doctor's degree. This chapter will be based on the assumption that most college faculties will be men and women of considerable intelligence, adequate academic preparation and reasonable but far from outstanding pedagogical rates. They probably need some curricular structure but probably not the structure presented by the staff developed general education courses of the late 1940's and early 1950's. As a correlary to such an assumption it can be argued that as formal academic qualifications of faculty members decline the need for carefully structured and drafted curriculum increases.

Although there is little evidence of qualitative gains in college teaching since the late nineteenth-century advent of the lecture-seminar-preparatory system, still, teaching is such an expensive part of college education, and symbolically so central to it, that it deserves specific attention. The issue should be resolved as to whether it can, or should be improved, or whether it should be simply left alone.

Criticism of College Teaching

From 1940 onward, the literature concerning collegiate education has been replete with argument that teaching should be improved, although all too frequently the exhorter has failed to indicate how. Typical of the demand is the plea of Rosecrance, "The improvement of college teaching is central to the improvement of higher education and deserves more attention than it has heretofore received. Students come to college to learn from persons whose scholarship is greater than their own. They deserve the best that can be provided. The institution itself depends in great part on the quality of the faculty, and the instruction given by it" (Rosencrance, 1962, pp. 189). Not quite so grandiose is the contention of Robert Goheen, "We hear much these days about the bleakness of the impersonal university, the neglect of teaching, and the pressures for research and publication. There is ground for concern, along with some exageration, in these charges" (Goheen, 1969,pp. 83-85). He continues with three major reasons why better teaching should be encouraged and sustained. The first was the rapid increase in enrollments, which meant that there would be proportionately fewer competent teachers. The second derives from the exploding diversity of knowledge. Relatedly, was the growing tension between research and teaching, with the attendant loss of energy devoted to teaching. A truly cosmic view of teaching is expressed by Elton Trueblood, who said that: It is easy to envision a good college with poor buildings, but it is not possible to envisage a good college with poor teachers. Brilliant and stimulating teaching could go on in temporary barracks, without any significant loss to the academic enterprise, but shoddy teaching means failure, even if it is conducted in palaces. Trueblood quotes, with considerable approbation, the remarks of Charles Malik: "The good teacher is the supreme actual instance of the conception of man and the universe on which liberal education is predicated. He has developed his reason, consequently he knows, he is in touch with the truth, he rejoices in its vision, and he can, through his art, impart that vision to others, and this noblest of all arts is the patient and loving leading of the student to see what the teacher himself sees, and this through problems, questions, challenges, puzzlement, discussion--and all--and this is the crucial thing--in the certain presence of the perfected knowledge of the teacher himself" (Trueblood, 1959, p. 33).

This theme of discussing the significance and centrality of teaching, and its poor actual state, was found repeatedly in educational conferences throughout the period. Francis English, in 1955, quoted the New York Times' educational editor, Benjamin Fine, that no more than 10% of college professors do an adequate teaching job, and he continued, almost cliche-like saying, "The charge is not new; the story of yellow notes of ancient vintage being the sources of uninspired, mumbling lectures is an old one. Unfortunately, it too often characterizes classroom performance, but there is no evidence that it predominates. There has been a great deal of inspired, adequate and solid teaching going on in American college classrooms. There needs to be more, and we hope it can become nearly universal. We must encourage it, talk about it, plan ways and means of bringing it about, and reward it when it happens" (English, 1955, pp. 93). A decade later, Bruce Dearing would point out the irony in an extraordinarily wealthy and talented system of higher education that the quality of undergraduate teaching was rarely praised.

Instead, there was, throughout the land, a flight from teaching and an often expressed fear that, "...the college student was becoming a forgotten man, and other widely circulated expressions of dismay and concern over the ways in which quality in undergraduate education has not kept pace with either traditional standards or expanding needs and opportunities." (Dearing, 1965, pp. 115). A few years later, in the 1971 issue of *Current Issues in Higher Education*, the fly-leaf proclaimed, "Teaching and learning used to be the central functions of the university, but somewhere this concept got lost in the shuffle. Recently, teaching and learning have been re-discovered--and found to be shockingly inadequate. Changes have to be made, everyone agrees, but change is not easy." Attempts to make changes have led to a frustrating impasse.

Such general observations appear, in part, to be substantiated by research concerning the influence of college teachers on students. On several surveys, students fail to mention teaching or particular teachers when given the opportunity to list the most significant influences on them during their college years. The variety of research analyzed by Feldman and Newcomb presented a variegated picture of teaching and teacher influence, with teachers in some subjects appearing reasonably influential but in others of virtually no significance. Typically, when faculties were seen as influential it was more likely to be in connection with career advising than pedagogy displayed in classrooms. Since the mid-1950's, a significant research literature emerged regarding the impact of college on students: "Most studies show that students going through college increase their interest in their civic and cultural values, decrease their adherance to traditional religion and other traditional values, become more relativistic and less moralistic in their ethical judgments. They also take an increasingly liberal, rather than conservative position on political and socio-economic issues and become open-minded, as measured by scales on authoritarianism, dogmatism, ethnocentricism, and prejudice." (Withey, 1971, pp. 27-8). Pace pointed out: "...that undergraduates acquire knowledge about a lot of subjects. The more they study a subject, the more they know about it. They know most about subjects that are most closely related to their major fields; but their knowledge in other fields also increases. Seniors know more than sophomores; juniors know more than freshmen." He pointed out that such findings had been consistently obtained over fifty years. (Pace, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 166). However, it is significant that almost no study links changes through teaching; rather, the changes seem to derive from the total environmental influence.

In spite of the hyperbole of higher education reformers, and the apocalyptic claims of perennial deterioration, a brief review of reasonably typical examples of college teaching between 1940 and 1980 does not reveal significant change in any direction. One finds some horrible examples, some sublime examples, and a great many rather ordinary examples. Thus, in the 1930's, courses in American history were taught by an intellectually powerful but personally bland individual who sat at a desk in front of a classroom of fifty students and read from a stack of 3 X 5 cards containing his research notes in a rosary-like fashion--one bead of fact after another. An English professor of a two-hundred student class in American Literature began each class session with recitation in unison of a far from powerful poem:

"Each day, a little later now
Lingers the west'ring sun
Far out of sight the miracles
Of April are begun"

Another professor of history, for a course for a hundred students, seated the ten males in the back row and arranged the ninety females in a rather precise order of pulchritude, from the first row on to the next to the last row. The teaching style consisted of slowly walking the width of the front of the room, rolling a pencil continuously between his hands, talking steadily, and observing carefully the legs and breasts of those front row students. A professor of agricultural education spoke twice a week to a two-hundred-fifty student lecture class, with each session stressing the Hay-way to health, which precluded eating meat and starch at the same time.

After World War II, college teaching remained the same, with the lecture method predominating, as, for example, the hour lecture delivered in English to the three students enrolled in Conversational French. One dimunitive German scientist lectured from a raised dais, so that he could, in his words, "dominate the class both physically and intellectually." In another course in humanities, seeking to develop student sensitivity to the good, the true, the beautiful, the fifty-minute class hour was devoted to hearing three students read papers, seemingly copied from encyclopedias, dealing with historical figures of Western Civilization. The only sound audible at the end of each reading was the scritch of professor's pen, inscribing the appropriate grade in the grade book. A sampling of over forty classes taught in nineteen institutions revealed the lecture as the predominent mode, pedestrian dullness as the predominent style, and student lassitude the predominent spirit.

The two classes judged as outstanding were, nonetheless, lectures, but the lecturers had been able to discover techniques of gaining some student participation, even in the large one-hundred-fifty student courses.

The age of innovation and reform during the 1960's and '70's, produced a few attempts to use technological devices and some techniques for ensuring participation, such as games. On the whole, classes across the country remained rather much the same. In one course in modern algebra, offered to thirty students, the professor spent the entire hour at the blackboard, back to the class, scrawling on the blackboard the proofs to three problems. The only eye-to-eye contact took place perhaps every five to seven minutes, as the instructor turned quickly, gazed at the class, and queried, "Okay?" In widely proclaimed experimental colleges, lecturing prevailed, but in a somewhat less organized style than in the more traditional institution. Lecturing also prevailed in the non-traditional institutions and programs, although it took place much less frequently than in traditional institutions, because classes met so infrequently. Here and there, there were such bright spots as using television monitors linked to computers, instead of the traditional blackboard, to demonstrate problem-solving in a graduate school of business; a new approach to language instruction, stressing small classes and much activity; and the video-taping of an entire lecture-course on the subject of women and the law.

Nor did the system change during the early 1980's. The equivalent of United States freshman college courses taught in a northern Mexican institution, consisted of thirty or forty students in each class, taught by means of rapid-fire lecturing. The same pattern was observed walking down the corridors of several church-related colleges, several prestige colleges and universities, and in a sampling of non-traditional programs. In some, lecturing was more precise than in others, but, whether the courses were offered to eighteen to twenty-two year olds or to the fatigued adults attending an evening course in a public junior college, the teaching was that of a single faculty member transmitting information, insight, and occasionally inspiration, to groups of relatively passive people.

Lest this review appear as a caricature, it should be pointed out that here and there, classes could be observed in which a lecturer would hold the audience spell-bound, or the lecturer was able to engage a full class in an active dialectic, and, in a large majority of classes, students did seem reasonably satisfied with the instructor's performance, and with their own achievement of idiosyncratic educational goals and objectives.

These concerns about teaching have been reflected in criticisms of college teaching and suggestions for improvement which have taken one of three forms. The first is a kind of generalized anxiety, and belief that college teaching is not as it might be, and that, somehow, it can be improved. Russell M. Cooper was fairly typical of this sort of commentary when he remarked that, "The demands upon college teaching in the 1960's are very different from those of 1860's or even the 1920's....More and more, the job requirements for... college teaching...are demanding a new kind of expertise. As these demands increase, the need for devoting special efforts to the preparation and in-service training of college teachers becomes increasingly important." (Cooper, 1965, pp. 196). The specifics of this sort of criticism typically assert that there is too much lecturing, that lecturing is not done very well, that too much use is made of teaching assistants, that it does not provide adequately for individual differences, and that the Ph.D. degree is a research degree which does not prepare people as teachers, and that, therefore, teaching is somehow bad. Sometimes, this sort of criticism was expressed in dramatic and even tragic rhetoric, as for example expressed by William Arrowsmith, who was only concerned with, "...the ancient, crucial high art of teaching, the kind of teaching which alone can claim to be called educational, an essential element in all noble human culture, and hence a task of infinitely more importance than research scholarship....Only when large demands of the teacher, when we ask him to assume a primary role as an educator in his own right, will it be possible to restore dignity to teaching." (Arrowsmith, 1968, pp. 116). Or, the criticism is prosaic, and somewhat mechanistically instrumental: "Every good teacher, including Socrates, has known that instruction should emphasize learning, not teaching. A problem arises as soon as formal education requires the instruction of many students of diverse interests and abilities in a group. Schools and colleges need to provide experiences that will help each individual student to learn and make him want to continue learning. How can institutions make instruction individual, and how can they clearly define the successive goals of learning and properly appraise a student's progress and ultimate achievement. There is very little satisfaction in any quarter with our efforts thus far to meet these exacting requirements." (Paschal, 1968, pp. 220). Most such criticisms express or imply the faith that somehow, mysteriously, formal preparation in pedagogy or understanding the use of educational technology, improvement should come about.

The second sort of criticism is that college teaching is deficient because it does not attend to the many facets of human development and is not based on psychological knowledge and research. Such criticisms contend that college teachers should, but don't, attend to developmental needs of college students, the social, psychological dynamics of classroom situations, or understand and modify traumatic behaviors, such as the use of grades as power to motivate student behavior. Much of this sort of criticism derives from psychological and psychoanalytic theory, as, for example, Joseph Katz borrowed the concept of transference from the clinic, remarking, "Tranference is a phenomenon that many teachers (and students) would rather not have exist. It introduces a bothersome element into the supposedly dispassionate intercourse of minds. Yet it is a potent vehicle for learning, mislearning, and not learning. Resistance to the teacher needs as careful attention in college learning as does resistance to the therapist in psychotherapy." (Katz, 1962, pp. 386).

The third kind of criticism is related to the second, and says, in essence, that college teaching as practiced in typical undergraduate residential situations is probably adequate for traditional kinds of college students, but that teaching strategies and techniques appropriate for them are inappropriate for many new kinds of students. It argues that in some (frequently unstated ways) older students, unmotivated students, underachieving students, impoverished students, or incarcerated students require significantly different techniques and behaviors on the part of teachers.

The validity of each of these three sorts of criticisms is seriously open to challenge. The three all share a weakness of assigning catholic and ideal qualities to what is, fundamentally, a relatively straight-forward professional practice capable of achieving important but limited outcomes. It is true that occasionally teaching has appeared to be almost miraculous, as when Helen Keller's teacher transformed the child's personality and outlook. Especially is the psychologically-based sort of criticism vulnerable, because few professors in the arts and sciences and in the majority of professional fields have training or experience in sophisticated psychological theory, and, very likely, no motivation to achieve insights beyond those which accumulate through years of teaching experience. To expect a professor of engineering, of economics, of French, or of history to use role-playing, group dynamics, sensitivity training, or even non-directive teaching is to expect much more than mortal men or women can demonstrate. If it requires a lifetime of study to maintain an understanding of American history, whence the time also to become sophisticated psychologically and socio-psychologically. Equally vulnerable is the criticism that meeting the needs of new kinds of students requires radically different techniques of instruction. New students, pursuing college-level courses in arts or sciences may need some accomodation with respect to fatigue at the end of a workday, some class-scheduling accomodation, the amount of study required, and, perhaps, some modification of motivational techniques. Transmitting information, organizing laboratory experiments, grading tests and written assignments, conducting discussions and selecting texts differs not significantly when dealing with eighteen to twenty-two year olds or with middle-aged men and women. Even using the much proclaimed self-paced instruction approach would appear to be the same whether for traditional or non-traditional students. For each group, the subject must be broken down into small parts, and activities prepared and materials prepared to facilitate student learning of each segment.

If different approaches to teaching are required, it probably is in connection with the below collegiate level of work, as in remedial work or work designed to develop quite basic skills of adult functioning. The question can be raised: Should collegiate institutions engage in such activities, and, if they should, should not true specialists be recruited to provide those services.

Nevitt Sanford has remarked disparagingly that elite institutions have been notably reluctant to embrace radical educational reforms and to encourage faculty members to adopt new psychological theories regarding teaching. He pointed out , "Elite institutions were noticeably absent from Project Change in Liberal Education, a three-year effort sponsored by the Commission on Liberal Learning of the Association of American Colleges in cooperation with four other national associations, devoted to developing and evaluating alternatives to traditional patterns and learning in the undergraduate liberal education. In fact, of the thirty institutions that participated, twelve were very obscure, if not invisible, colleges, eleven were among the already experimenting colleges, and the remaining seven were quite far back in the academic procession. Just as the idea of faculty development has spread throughout most of higher education, but will only eventually penetrate the elite institutions--and then probably only under a different name--so is it the case that elite institutions seldom lead in implementing ideas about student development generated by their own scholars." (Sanford, 1981, pp. 23). Several interpretations, of course, can be made of that factually correct observation. One is that the elite institutions succeed in spite of faculty obtuseness, and the other is that the elite institutions succeed because they persist in doing what they have historically done best and do not attempt things beyond their capabilities.

Elite college and university faculties tend to be highly-trained academically, tend to engage in serious research and scholarship, and tend to teach courses reflecting that research and scholarship. Students in elite colleges and universities are apparently not too satisfied with what such faculties provide them, for the degree-completion rate is substantially higher than in the non-elite institutions.

Although one can find quite elaborate lists of objectives for undergraduate collegiate education, what is actually done in college courses is to deal with knowledge as C. Robert Pace has remarked. He believed, "... that the acquisition of knowledge is the primary, and certainly the most obvious aim of college courses and curriculum. Professors seek to impart knowledge of facts and principles, of generalizations and concepts, of ways of thinking about phenomena, of interpretations of data and meanings, of underlying assumptions, and similar information and processes related to the subject matter of their courses." (Pace, op. cit., 1980, pp. 173). The same point is made somewhat differently by Russell Kirk, pointing out that the undergraduate liberal-arts curriculum was essentially literary, that is, the majority of the work done consisted of reading and trying to comprehend the ideas provided by written expression. Many will argue that such a conception of undergraduate education is excessively narrow. They argue that teaching and college courses should seek to develop ethical standards, psychological adjustment, better inter-personal relationships, a deepened sense of personal values, and sympathy for many different kinds of people. All of these are laudable and commendable elements of human development, but there can be serious question as to whether college teachers and college courses are the appropriate instruments to facilitate achievement of such goals.

College teachers have, during the twentieth century, been prepared for the role through graduate study of some subject. Whether the degree earned and used is a master's or a Ph.D., graduate students learn a great deal about some subject, and, especially doctoral students, learn considerable about doing research in that subject, so that more and more knowledge can be obtained. What graduate students learn about teaching comes primarily from five to ten years observing their own teachers, and they typically will model their subsequent teaching behavior after the characteristics of their own teachers, with whom they could identify. In relatively few situations do graduate students take courses in the psychology of learning, in methods of teaching, or dealing with the history or purposes of higher education--nor is there demonstrable reason why they should. Graduate education essentially deals with the study of some subject in reasonable depth to prepare people subsequently to teach that same subject to others for any of a variety of reasons. The methods to be used to teach those subjects will be developed by models, occasionally through teaching experience while still a graduate student, but, primarily, through trial and error during the early years of a teaching career.

This kind of preparation appears to develop ability on the part of college teachers to perform their essential tasks. They may be quickly summarized as the selection of knowledge to be incorporated in a course, organizing that knowledge, transmitting it, clarifying it, and helping students to understand the complexity of that knowledge. College teachers do seemingly affect the development of higher mental processes, but typically in the context of a given body of knowledge. They also should, and frequently do, impose standards by evaluating student performance and through personal behavior and example. Additionally, college teachers living within the academic community, have the power (just as every other individual in that community) to influence through friendship and personal interaction. The traits needed for that are those developed throughout the teacher's lifetime. Now, it should be stressed, and will be repeatedly in this chapter, that the performance of each of these activities can continuously be improved. Better and better written materials can be found and organized more clearly. Techniques of transmission of knowledge can be improved, as can problems designed to facilitate development of higher mental processes. Desired standards can be clarified, so that students can know what is expected of them. Approaches to such improvement will subsequently be discussed.

However, there are many desirable activities which college teachers are incompetent to perform by virtue of their academic preparation and by informed experience. College students experience a range of psychological and emotional problems, and, frequently, trauma. It has been said that perhaps 20% or more of college students experience a debilitating level of free-floating anxiety. Certainly it is true that the traditional college-age student of eighteen to twenty-two year olds is trying to understand his or her own sexuality, emotional development, and changing relationships with others. However, college teachers will possess only a person's ability to assist with respect to such matters, an ability acquired through the processes of becoming an adult. The intensive study of French literature does not qualify a professor to deal with student loneliness, the mastery of United States intellectual history does not prepare professors to help students deal with sexual hang-ups, and a Ph.D. in physics is no preparation for professional involvement in group dynamics. In short, nothing in the formal education of college teachers prepares them to be psychotherapists, psychometricians, social workers, pastors, or learning theorists, and to expect college teachers to develop through practice into such specialists is inconsistent with why people became college teachers in the first place. They became college teachers because they enjoyed the in-depth study of something which they came to believe would be valuable for someone else to learn. It is true that, occasionally, a college teacher will be impressed by reading in the literature of developmental psychology, and, occasionally, as an avocation, a professor will develop diagnostic and therapeutic skills, but such exceptions have been rare in the past and will probably be equally rare in the future, in spite of the exhortations of some radical educational reformers.

Improvement of College Teaching

Because college teaching has frequently been perceived as less than ideal, and because it is, essentially, such an expensive, labor-intensive activity, much has been suggested to improve it. These suggestions have, for the most part, been one of three general sorts: administrative and bureaucratic provisions to facilitate improvement, radical reform requiring new and quite different skills on the part of teachers, and common sense reforms of the use of reasonably traditional methods of teaching. One of the most frequently urged administrative reforms is to modify the academic reward system, so that the act of teaching is regarded as a high and valuable calling. The argument is made that the rewards of promotion, tenure, and salary increases are based more on research productivity, hence encouraging faculty members to devote more time to research and less to teaching. This argument has a spurious quality to it, in the face of the fact that in the vast majority of collegiate institutions, faculty members typically do little research, beyond keeping up with their subject and preparing for their courses. Furthermore, the argument rests on the unestablished premise that research and teaching are incompatible. A reasonable argument can be made that, rather than being incompatible, research, scholarship, and teaching are highly interacting activities, with improvement in one being quickly reflected in improvement in another. Thus, it can be argued that the active and productive researcher is constantly gaining new insights with which to enlighten teaching, and that the professor actively examining the frontiers of his or her subject is likely to be a more interesting teacher than is the one who continues to reiterate knowledge obtained as a graduate student. In some institutions, a reward system which stresses research may produce an imbalance in the expenditure of faculty time and energy which favors research, but there is virtually no evidence that what time is devoted to teaching is qualitatively inferior.

In addition to the predominent reward system, institutions frequently attempt to provide other administrative incentives to encourage greater attention to the role of college teacher. Some make titular or financial awards for outstanding teachers, while others will provide released faculty time to improve teaching techniques. Many institutions have adopted systems of formal student evaluation of teaching, the results of which are reviewed by faculty superiors and placed in the faculty member's permanent file. It seems reasonable that the existence of such incentives may stimulate individuals to think a bit more about teaching activities and behavior. However, it can also be argued that although college teachers as undergraduates did not plan to enter college teaching as a career, once they found themselves in such a role, they came to enjoy teaching and to want to do it well. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of college teachers rank teaching as their predominent activity and source of satisfaction. In a sense, incentives simply may essentially intensify urges for improvement already present in individuals. It is difficult to conceive of a professor not responding emotionally to student evaluation either highly complimentary or sharply critical. It is difficult to conceive of a professor not experiencing feelings of pride after a successful lecture, thus leading to attempts to improve other lectures.

During the 1960's and '70's, many institutions made structural provisions to express a concern for improvement of teaching. Some created centers for the improvement of instruction, which offered professors help in improvement of lecturing skills, test development, and the preparation and use of audio-visual aids. Such centers frequently were given budgets from which to grant small sums to faculty members to experiment with some new teaching device or approach. The testimony of directors of such centers indicate that they are used by some faculty members, and that particularly the grants for experimentation had been judged as useful by recipients. However, the relatively small size of center staffs in large institutions, is probably evidence that center services are used by only a minority of the active professoriat. Other institutions have created offices variously labeled dean of undergraduate studies or dean of instruction, with an assignment to give administrative attention to undergraduate education, including undergraduate teaching. These officers will frequently have small budgets to be used to stimulate development of new courses and to provide released time for professors to develop new approaches. Such officers participating in high administrative councils probably ensures that educational concerns receive executive attention, just as do fiscal concerns. Still other institutions place retired professors having had great reputations as teachers on partial salary to enable them to consult with active professors on the problems and perplexities of teaching. Stanford University, for example, in 1981, maintained eleven such role-models. Some institutions have developed an ethos permitting professors and administrators to visit each other's classes and to discuss pedagogical questions and issues. Testimony from such places suggest that, over time, classroom visits cease to threatening and become helpful and even enjoyable. Relatedly, some institutions develop videotape service which allows professors who desire the service to have classes videotape-recorded--recordings which professors can subsequently examine in hopes of improving performance. Still other institutions maintain libraries of books on higher education and college teaching, while others bring onto the campus periodically visiting professors who have a reputation as being effective teachers. All of this activity probably has some effect, at least symbolically, by indicating that the institution is concerned with the quality of college teaching, and this symbolic concern very likely produces some additional introspection on the part of individual professors as to what they do after they close the door at the opening of each class meeting.

Throughout the forty years from 1940 to 1980, there were repeated criticisms that the Ph.D. was a research degree, hence not entirely satisfactory to prepare college teachers. It was argued that there should be a degree especially designed to prepare people for the role of undergraduate teacher. During the 1950's, some institutions tried to create divisional Ph.D.s, but these did not take, primarily because faculties insisted that the divisional Ph.D. in physical science, for example, actually was required to take courses equivalent to those required for a Ph.D. in physics and a Ph. D. in chemistry. During the '50s, partly in response to a Ford Foundation grant, some institutions tried to create an enriched master's degree, as being quite appropriate for undergraduate teaching, especially lower-division undergraduate teaching. During the late 1960's and 1970's, a few institutions experimented with a doctor of arts degree to prepare people for undergraduate education. This degree allowed students to study several related disciplines, and to study the history and philosophy of higher education, as well as courses dealing with collegiate pedagogy. In a few institutions, the doctor of arts degree flourished, primarily as a part-time program, allowing people already teaching in community colleges, for example, to acquire a doctoral degree. However, even apologists for the degree, such as Paul L. Dressel, were unable to document widespread adoption of the degree, with the number of individuals receiving it remaining relatively small compared to the thousands receiving the Ph.D. degree each year. It might have been that the doctor of arts degree could have assumed prominence, had a shortage of college teachers remained throughout the 1970's. However, a shortage disappeared by 1970, with an over-supply of Ph.D.s becoming serious by the end of the decade. That over-supply placed the doctor of arts degree in direct competition with the far more prestigious Ph.D. degree. Most institutions, given the choice of a Ph.D. or a doctor of arts for a new appointment, typically would opt for the more prestigious degree.

Over all, these administrative and structural arrangements have probably been important symbolically. They were relatively inexpensive ways of emphasizing the importance of good teaching and, in aggregate, probably stimulated self-improvement efforts on the part of some number of active professors--there being no way of determining how many. The continuation of such efforts can be sincerely recommended, so long as educational leaders do not expect them to produce a radical transformation of the pedagogical climate.

The second category of reform can be called the radical reforms, which seem to call for significantly new goals and competencies on the part of the professoriat. Spokesmen for such reforms either premise their arguments on the assertion that traditional modes of teaching are wrong and very likely destructive, or on the premise that radically new approaches to teaching are necessary as new kinds of students enroll in colleges and universities.

Radical reformers seek such major changes as seemingly to transform the essential nature of collegiate education. They argue from the premise that colleges and universities must acommodate the quite different needs of new students described as less able, less achieving, less economically secure, and older than the traditional students. Further, as college teaching copes with those, the need to apply similar new approaches to traditional students would become overwhelming. Especially high in their list of priorities is for higher education to give explicit curricular and instructional attention to issues in human relations and the development of better personal skills. They argue, that, people say in all kinds of ways, that they feel inadequate in their personl lives to relate appropriately to co-workers, family, and friends. Participation in personal growth seminars and in interpersonal-relations workshops is unprecedented. The potential for helping all students, new and traditional, to improve interpersonal skills is very great. Although most of the research shows that college students do gain in interpersonal skills throughout their college careers, their education in this area is more by accident than degign. It appears to be the result of group living and close acquaintance with a variety of people. Strong trends toward non-residential education may decrease even the present feeble attempts to help people to relate to people. Thus, these reformers argue, it is imperative that conscious attention be given to both adequacy and excellence in the development of inter-personal skills. How they expect college teachers generally to develop responsible expertise in this essentially therapeutic activity, is not mentioned except to plead that it should be done. It is apparently assumed that disciplinary-trained faculty members can and will develop skills to conduct t-groups and sensitivity-training encounters to formally help college students develop feeling and emotion as of equal significance to obtaining knowledge and intellectual development.

When such reformers turn their attention to pedagogical changes concerned with the historic missions of collegiate education, they also demanded faculty development of major new skills and goals. What they have in mind can be discovered through a discussion of individualizing learning, mastery learning, and cognitive styles: The teacher assumes the role of manager; he or she prepares materials, diagnoses, prescribes, motivates, and serves as a resource for the student. The emphasis is on learning, rather than teaching.

They essentially call for all professors to become learning psychologists in order to provide for individualized instruction, the principles of which can be quickly summarized: 1) The student must be an active rather than a passive; 2) the goals of learning must be clear and must be made explicit to the student; 3) very closely related to the need for course objectives, is the desirability of small lesson-units (frequently referred to as learning-modules) dealing with a single concept; 4) effective learning requires feedback and evaluation; 5) recognizing the enormous individual differences in rate of learning (not only do individuals differ from one another, but most of us differ from time to time and from task to task in our own learning efficiency), all approaches to individualized instruction feature self-pacing--permitting the learner to control to a greater or lesser degree, the pace of presentation. In moments of candor the reformers may admit that college teachers might not possess some of the skills and understandings proposed--that not one teacher or counselor in a hundred knows anything at all about cognitive styles, despite the fact that research on cognitive styles has been going on for twenty-five years in some psychology laboratories. Yet they obviously would like professors to cope with a variety of dimensions of cognitive style, such as 1) field independence vs. field dependence, 2) scanning, 3) breadth of categorizing, 4) conceptualizing styles, 5) cognative complexity vs. simplicity, 6) reflectiveness vs. impulsivity, 7) leveling vs. sharpening, 8) constricted vs. flexible control, and 9) tolerance for incongruous or unrealistic experiences.

As was indicated in connection with the discussion of the curriculum, the developmental psychology point of view was from the 1950's onward regularly raised in connection with collegiate education. However, Nevitt Sanford, one of the more eloquent spokesmen for developmental psychology remarked, few college teachers saw much relevance for what they did. Nonetheless, theorists continued to urge that college teaching focus more on developmental needs and the insights of a number of those theorists were presented (Chickering and associates, 1981). They proposed that colleges and universities concern themselves with human development, and that the values and aims of human development be taken as a unifying purpose and framework for all institutional effort, and that teaching practices be developed to conform to developmental postulates.

It is impossible to summarize how those various theorists view teaching and teaching behavior. However, Menges' concerns are illustrative of the over-all point of view. He argued that the major learning outcome intended by college teachers could be classified as: psychomotor, memory, complex cognitive, nonlinear cognitive, and emotional. Disciplinary-trained college professors would have no difficulty with the first three of those outcomes--writing, or using a computer keyboard, obtaining and retaining information, and mentally manipulating it. However, as described, nonlinear cognitive outcomes and emotions as learning outcomes suggest some radical pedagogical departure from traditional styles of the professoriate. Thus, Menges argues, "Nonlinear cognition begins with the recognition of discrete states of consciousness. These states are conventionally said to be five: waking, dreamless sleep, dreaming, meditation, and hypnosis. . . . Dreams, fantasies, images, and self-hypnosis are all methods that serve nonlinear cognition" (Menges, 1981, p. 560). With respect to emotions as learning outcomes, after granting that some teachers might deny the importance or appropriateness of emotion, he indicated that the first step toward emotional literacy required knowing one's own emotional state. Thereafter, "Sending and receiving feeling-laden communications is a higher level of emotional learning. Assuming that I am in touch with my emotional state, can I communicate it accurately to another? Does my anger look like anger, or do I distort it? Are affectionate feelings shown as affection, or do they appear to be something else? Likewise, do I accurately perceive emotions expressed by others when they communicate with me?

"Possessing a repertoire of emotional states permits one to better discriminate and control one's emotions. In one situation, a person may 'let it all hang out.' In a second situation the person will be able to empathize fully with the feelings expressed by another--entering into a friend's grief, for example. In a third situation, on the basis of physiological cues, the person may be able to differentiate potentially confusing states--for example, to distinguish felt depression from felt hostility and respond appropriately" (Ibid, p. 561). Asking professors to engage in pedagogy dealing with such matters assumes considerable psychological sophistication and willingness to devote considerable time employing new techniques. Whether or not this is a reasonable expectation must stand as a basis for some skepticism.

Equally demanding that professors develop many new skills not generated by their own academic preparation is the doctrine of a systems approach to teaching. Overly simplified, this posits that instructors develop lists of quite specific behaviors on the part of students which instructors wish to produce, followed by careful selection of teaching techniques most likely to produce those changes, followed by careful preparation and use of measuring instruments designed to demonstrate whether or not the behaviors have been modified. This doctrine derived from theories developed by Ralph W. Tyler, and it is exemplified by the long list of possible objectives presented by Bloom (1950). As a general way of thinking about the task of instruction, the approach probably has much to commend it. However, subsequent advocates seem to imply that the act of teaching can become almost a science, and that there are quite specific ways to develop each of a wide variety of quite specific objectives as described by such theoriests as John Reuche of the University of Texas. Planning for an hour of classroom would involve specifying a substantial number of objectives, and, for each, a quite specific instructional intervention.

The variety of radical recommendations for improvement of college teaching is great. Some derive from psychoanalysis and would have professors use almost therapeutic methods. Others derive from behavioristic psychology, and would have professors function with the precision of a controlled psychological experiment. Still others derive from religion and would have professors assume almost a pastoral role in helping students deal with ethical dilemmas. Still others almost derive from physiology and would have professors tailor their teaching so as to affect one or the other of the hemispheres of the brain. All such approaches assume willingness on the part of college faculty members, over time, to develop the requisite new sophistication.

Much more plausible from the standpoint of suggesting ways of improving college teaching, are the common-sense recommendations advanced by Jacques Barzun, Wilbert J. McKeachie, or Kenneth E. Eble. These recommendations typically assume that what college teachers are primarily concerned with is intellectual development, although recognizing that by-products of teaching so oriented will likely, from time to time, affect emotions, personality and deeply-held values. They also assume that collegiate pedagogy will typically employ a limited number of instruments--lecturing, discussions, formal assignments, laboratory exercises, and tests and grading. The burden of the message of the common-sense reformers is that the use of such instruments can be improved. Eble most clearly exemplifies this general position, remarking, "Despite the vast collective experience teachers can draw upon, there are still genuine questions as to whether teaching can be reduced to any set of essentials. The individuality of the teacher and of the students, the particular characteristics of subject matter, the multiple goals of learning, the contexts of teaching and learning--all seem to defy any clear statement about how a good teacher should go about the task" (Eble, 1972, p. 36). He then enumerates the characteristics or essentials of good teaching as involving humility, generosity, sheer energy, ability to perform, variety, enthusiasm, knowledge, honesty, and a sense of proportion. Eble's approach to teaching is captured by the title of another book he wrote called The Craft of Teaching (Eble, 1976). In jargon-free chapters, he presents plausible praise of utilizing the classroom, lecturing, conducting discussions, using seminars, tutorials, and advising, selecting texts, making assignments, administering tests and assigning grades. In many respects, the best advice which could be given to improve college teaching would be to recommend that all teachers periodically read Eble's The Craft of Teaching and Wilbert J. McKeachie's Tips on Teaching.

Rather than urging that college teachers undertake activities for which they are unprepared and unwilling to undertake, improvement in teaching might be attempted through policies and recommendations encouraging faculty members to do those things for which they are prepared, rather than following the recommendations of the radical reformers to employ more and more non-academics as teachers. Improvement of teaching might be achieved through institutions demanding more and more rigorous academic preparation of those appointed to teach. This would mean that all institutions, including two-year colleges, would seek faculty members holding the Ph.D. degree, either in the arts and sciences or in professional fields. If institutions were unable to recruit well-trained Ph.D.s they might seek holders of master's degrees in subjects they were expected to teach who had had at least a full academic year of courses above the level of courses faculty members would be expected to teach. Following the logic of this recommendation, the doctor of arts degree holder, offering a teaching major and a related teaching minor, would be less preferable than the in-depth preparation in a single subject of the Ph.D. holder, but somewhat more preferable than the single-subject master's degree-holder. This is based on the belief that what happens in a classroom is related to the depth and sophistication of knowledge of a subject held by the instructor. It is the instructor's knowledge of a subject which generates the enthusiasm which appears to be so critical for effective teaching.

It probably would be desirable, although not imperative, if graduate students had received some supervised teaching experience during their graduate study. In this connection, it should be pointed out that graduate students have been closely observing teaching for seventeen or more years, and that that intensity of experience is probably more influential than a single one-semester or year of teaching, while expending most energy on graduate study itself. The real preparation for college teaching is a combination of those long years observing others, and then the trial and error experiences obtained during the first five to ten years of actual teaching. If graduate students wish to take courses on the characteristics of college students, methods of teaching, or the nature and history of higher education, there can be no serious objection. Knowing something about college students and college institutions could conceivably ease adjustment of young faculty members, but there is no persuasive evidence that doing so is an imperative. In this connection, it should be observed that effective teaching is probably the result of the style of the college teacher, developed over time, with there being as many different styles as there are faculty members. Style is developed over time, and not through the superficial acquisitions of a few skills or ideas learned in brief courses on psychology and pedagogy.

As for rigorous academic preparation, it is desirable for full-time college teachers. Similarly, should it be required on the part of the growing number of part-time faculty? One of the major weaknesses in a number of part-time or external-degree programs is that the part-time faculty members all too frequently have had less intensive academic preparation than those individuals appointed to full-time positions in the professoriat. Institutions would be well served, if they would demand that part-time faculty be appointed through screening procedures exactly like those employed for full-time faculty members. This would suggest, for example, that the director of an off-campus program would not be authorized to appoint part-time faculty members whose credentials had not been carefully reviewed through established procedures on the home campus.

The matter of preparation and qualification of faculty members, especially in public community colleges, who teach clearly vocational-skills courses, such as carpentry, automobile mechanics, or inhalator therapy is a problem. In some respects the ideal resolution of this issue would be not to award academic credit countable for an academic degree, although countable for some form of credential or certificate. Such denial would allow for the experienced carpenter or mechanic to concentrate on training for specific skills. However, such a recommendation is clearly no longer possible, given the existence of community colleges awarding associate degrees for a variety of vocational programs. This being true, those employing faculty for vocational courses should insist upon depth of vocational experience comparable to the depth of knowledge acquired through rigorous academic or professional graduate programs. This would mean that a vocational teacher should, at a minimum, have had as many years of full-time vocational experience as the academic teacher had in undergraduate and graduate preparation. The experience should be directly in the subject taught and not tangential to it, as so frequently happens. Further, since teaching style develops over time, it is probably as important in the vocational subject as in an academic one. Preference should always be to full-time vocational faculty, over part-time, on the ground that over the years the full-time faculty member is likely to develop an effective and consistent style, not possible through occasionally teaching a course.

Essential to the argument being offered is that college teaching is an important, but limited, activity, capable of producing some outcomes, but not intended to produce an infinite variety of outcomes. The college teacher should, in no way, be encouraged to act as surrogate for parents, therapists, pastors, social workers, medical doctors, or Boy Scout leaders. It is true that some college teachers, as mature adults, can provide some nurturing to some students. However, such service should be viewed as the product of adulthood, rather than a product of the professional role as college professor. The college professor should introduce students to a subject, transmit information about that subject, help students to think about the subject, and encourage students to deepen their own comprehension and understanding. The subject taught should be selected in the belief that, somehow or other, studying the subject will be useful for the intellectual growth and maturation of the student.

If one adopts such a parsimonious view of teaching, then the number of techniques to be mastered becomes relatively small. A number of the common sense critics of teaching have produced such lists of skills, one of which consists of using materials, preparation of courses and for classes, speaking, listening, responding and testing and grading. A major step in the improvement of the quality of college teaching would be to ensure that every college teacher had a reasonable and growing mastery of what is taught, together with definite competency with respect to those basic skills. It is probably true that simply adhering to those characteristics may not produce inspired or brilliant teaching. If there are such things, they very likely are products of individual temperament, style, beliefs, attitudes of the professor, acquired over a lifetime, and, concerning which, collegiate administrators can do nothing except treasure them when they appear.

Because the concept of behavioral objectives loomed so large in educational literature from the end of World War II onward, some comment is appropriate. There appear to be a variety of legitimate skills and objectives which college and university professors are competent to seek, and for the achievement of which there are available the necessary technologies. For undergraduate students these would include skills of reading, writing, speaking, and calculating. In professional programs, these would include the full variety of skills needed for professional practice, such as surveying, taking medical histories, developing a legal brief, or doing dental extractions. Beyond those skills, professors can probably consciously seek three major objectives with respect to courses taught. These would be possession of considerable knowledge about the subject, in-depth understanding of the subject, and development and application of materials of the subject in emerging situations. College professors, over time, can develop ways of seeking to achieve those outcomes, but neither classroom time, nor professorial background and experience will allow for explicit effort to achieve more refined and elaborated kinds of behavior objectives. In the earlier-cited taxonomy of educational objectives, cognitive domain, hundreds of quite specific and valid outcomes are presented. However, it is argued here that student achievement of those objectives will typically not come from explicit exercises to achieve each one, but, rather from a deepening, over time, of knowledge, understanding, and ability to apply. Consider, for example, one desired competence posited at Alverno College: "To develop a facility for making value judgments and independent decisions: to identify own values, to demonstrate understanding of philosophy, history, religion, arts, and/or literature as reflections of values, to demonstrate understanding of relationship of values to scientific and technological development, to make value judgements for which you a) identify viable alternatives, and b) forecast and weigh consequences, to demonstrate understanding of the validity of value systems differing from culture to culture, and to communicate value judgments effectively, either to defend them or to persuade others to them, and demonstrate commitment to them" (Grant, 1979, p. 274). These are not trivial expectations, however, one must wonder whether or not a professor can or even should develop specific exercises and activities for each of these and the hundreds of others which could also be stated. Realistically, development of such competencies would seem to derive from knowledge, understanding, and ability to apply some judgment, skills which may deepen and become more complex over time if individuals continue to immerse themselves in the subject. An analogy may be drawn from foreign language instruction. Several years of foreign language study at best may develop rudiments out of which linguistic competence may come, if the individual subsequently is continuously exposed to that language.

The rate of forgetting the language proceeds preciptiously after instruction has ceased to the extent that within a relatively few years only vestiges of facility remain.

The substance of this argument can be indicated rhetorically, if perhaps a bit unfairly: Which professor would one be likely to prefer: one who has a deep understanding of a subject and has well-developed skills of selecting materials, preparing for class, speaking, listening, reasoning, and testing and grading. Or one with relatively superficial understanding of a subject, but one who has developed an extensive list of specific behavioral objectives, and who spends enormous time developing techniques and devices suitable for each one?

Clearly some comment regarding educational technology and quality of teaching must be made. Advocates of educational technology see its use as revolutionizing education through the use of radio, open and closed-circuit television, videotapes, audiotapes, computer-based instruction, and the use of satellites to reach distant educational markets. Advocates see a fourth revolution in education, and research on the uses of technology reveals that in many situations technologically-based instruction produces measurable and significant changes in people. Entire courses can be videotape recorded and offered in remote areas. Computers can be programmed to interact with students more precisely than a human teacher can interact.

However, for a variety of reasons, educational technology is likely to remain supportive or enriching of classroom instruction in colleges and universities, rather than replacements. First is the sheer matter of cost. While the cost of technology is decreasing, every comprehensive study of costs indicates that the total cost of instruction based on technology is higher than the total cost of instruction based on a classroom. There is no evidence that the educational outcomes are sufficiently great to warrant the additional cost. Where the use of technology is warranted economically is where high-cost technology-based instruction is mixed with less expensive instruction to yield a sustainable cost. A carefully computerized simulation game in political science can enrich the insights of students regarding political processes. However, it becomes affordable only when linked with the more cost-effective, large lecture class, to provide basic information and understanding.

Technology can provide many critical services. Word-processers can facilitate composition of papers. Computers can solve problems and facilitate bibliographic searches, video tape recordings of teachers can show them ways to improve their performance, and a few credit courses delivered over open-circuit television can reach thousands of students in an urban area. However, even using those techniques places an economic cost and an additional burden on faculty members which they are not likely willingly to use. Eble captures reality with his remark, "Teachers will continue to do the easiest thing, both because of natural inclination and because of the many demands made on their time. Slide and computer freaks will continue to put on dazzling shows; some of their expertise will rub off on other teachers. But we have a long way to go before any of the electronic media--even the taperecorder and the projector--become natural parts of instruction" (Eble, 1976, p. 81).

One of the better ways to improve the quality of college teaching would be for faculty members to make more precise and rigorous demands on student performance. The radical reformers, during the 1960's and '70's, gained a great deal of attention by exploiting the fact that materials assigned to students to study were frequently irrelevant to student interests and needs, that tests and examinations frequently required primarily rote memory of information which would be forgotten immediately afterwards, that graduation requirements were frequently based on such non-educational reasons as departmental desire to increase enrollments, and that many course requirements demanded skills and traits not possessed by many new or non-traditional students. Using psychological theory more than empirical evidence, the radical reformers urged that students participate in developing their own work assignments and use their own satisfaction to evaluate their performance. Much of the essence of the non-traditional movement was to remove the constraints of previously imposed requirements so that the non-traditional student could participate in ways convenient to him or her.

A different posture regarding such matters can be taken. The solution to inadequate text materials and assignments would be the improvement of their quality and precision, not their elimination. The answer to narrow testing would be to improve the quality of tests, not their elimination. The answer to graduation requirements would be making them more defensible, rather than removing them. If the parsimonious view of teaching expressed here is accepted, that very acceptance would dictate the direction of reform. If the professor accepts the fact that the primary objectives are knowledge, understanding, and ability to apply, then materials can be selected and assignments made clearly designed to facilitate those three things. Similarly, if test questions are carefully designed to determine student possession of knowledge and understanding and ability to relate those to new situations, tests will have, as they always have, a powerful effect on student approach to learning.

Several issues remain. Some students urge a futurist posture with respect to college teaching, possibly suggesting significant change in its practice. As this chapter indicates, the future of college teaching is quite likely to resemble, in most detail, practices which have prevailed for almost a century. Despite afficionados of educational technology, there is no persuasive evidence that computer assisted individualized instruction is likely to replace classroom teachers or that complete videotape cassette recorded courses will even challenge the individual professor, classroom, textbook and group of students. Nor does it seem likely that college professors generally will adopt new roles suggested by recently suggested newer psychological theories.

There are a number of promising developments, however, which can be employed to help the average college or university professor to become somewhat more proficient. The first of these is to place more emphasis on some efforts to evaluate teaching, in the belief that those efforts will almost inevitably stimulate professors to think a bit more about what they do in the classrooms. In many respects the one quasi-revolutionary development during the 1960's and '70's was the widespread adoption of student course evaluation with the results used administratively. Suddenly faculty members, even in the major research universities, began to think about teaching and even occasionally to talk about it. This enhanced significance of the concept of pedagogy led many to experiment with such simple refinements as joint teaching of courses, duplication and advanced distribution of lecture notes, more carefully coordinated bibliographies and course topics, and more carefully prepared examinations. Thus, Deans and Presidents wishing to do something about college teaching might use their not inconsiderable influence to institutionalize the practice of student evaluation of teaching and then further to institutionalize other approaches to evaluation including self-reports, peer reports and administrator reports. A second technique previously mentioned is repeated here because of its significance. That is, to develop the expectation in all kinds of institutions that an important use of professorial time for which institutions pay salaries is to engage in some significant form of research and scholarship. If college teaching is to be improved it will come from a constantly deepening understanding of subjects taught on the part of those who profess them. This means that in every single week, ideally, every professor would spend some reasonable amount of time in research and scholarship related to the subjects they teach. Eventually this means that evidence of research and scholarship will be used in making decisions about retention, promotion, tenure and salary increases.

A somewhat more difficult approach would be to create an ethos in all kinds of institutions within which professors expect to spend a reasonable amount of time advising students and working with them in face-to-face consultation. This is not to suggest that professors become psychological counselors or therapists, but it is to suggest that if most students can experience a one-to-one relationship with one faculty member, the overall intellectual climate of an institution is likely to improve. That condition requires that all or most professors seriously relate to at least a few students.

As has been repeatedly stressed, teaching is an important but limited kind of behavior utilizing a limited number of techniques for limited purposes. For average teachers it is not a set of behaviors requiring assimilation of esoteric theories and technology. It is a human kind of activity which can be improved just as other basic human activities are improved through effort to modify a limited number of practices.

Chapter VII

Academic Leadership

If academic quality is to be restored and maintained in American higher education it must of course result from actions taken on individual campuses. It will not result from policy formulation and recommendations unless those are accepted and acted upon by individuals and their institutions. Individual and collective efforts with respect to academic quality can best be generated by restoring to college and university presidents and their central administrations some necessary powers and prerogatives which had diminished during the 1950s, 60s and 70s. Consider a number of specific decisions which seem essential if academic quality is to be maintained. Responsibility for each of these would seem to rest with campus central administration if it is to reside any place at all.

Needed Powers of Presidents

The first of these is perhaps the most difficult to achieve, yet probably is the most essential. It is institutional self-denial based on a belief that no institution can be completely comprehensive of its type and that many good things should not be undertaken. Not all universities need to maintain a medical school and not all liberal arts colleges need to offer music majors. This is one principle which appears to be equally valid for marginal institutions seeking sheer survival or reasonably strong institutions seeking enhancement of quality. Both types of institutions examine what they are doing, what they would like to be doing and make decisions as to what should be stressed and what things should be de-emphasized or eliminated.

The actual processes by which decisions are finally made to emphasize one program and to de-emphasize or eliminate another will be laborious, emotional, protracted and will involve a great deal of discussion, consultation and self-study. However, it is central administration which must raise questions concerning programs, which must maintain the inertia of planning and which must finally make the budget decisions to carry out whatever is intended. A good example of a program which could be questioned is the School of Education of Stanford University which on several national poles has been judged the ranking school of education in the country. However, as the national demand for educational workers has declined, and as Stanford's tuition increased, the School has experienced a steady decline in enrollment and an equally steady decline in applications. The other professional schools in the University--Business, Engineering, Earth Sciences, Law and Medicine have not experienced similar declines, in large measure because the financial rewards in those fields are sufficiently high to warrant payment of very high tuition. Educational salaries simply have not kept pace, as for example a substantial number of graduates of the Graduate School of Business obtained first-year salaries equal to the $45,000 average salaries of full professors at Stanford. The budget of the School of Education appropriated by the University is almost $2,000,000 out of a total operating budget for the University of $150,000,000. There can be no question that the faculty of the School of Education is well regarded and it collectively contributes much to the research and scholarship about education. But if demand for its program continues to decline, at some point the President and Provost of the University will be forced to ask themselves if the School of Education has become a luxury it can no longer afford if it is to maintain strength in the other units of the institution.

The second imperative is also fraught with danger for it suggests that presidents and central administrative officers should review recommendations for appointment, retention and promotion of faculty and be prepared to make substantive decisions. There has grown up the belief and tradition that judgment of professorial quality can only be made by competent peers and certainly such individuals should have significant voice in personnel decisions. However, central administration properly should create processes which will insure attention to qualitative standards and be prepared to overturn faculty recommendation if quality considerations have been overlooked or underemphasized. It is all too easy for members of a given department or school to allow biases of friendship or disciplinary compatibility to sway judgments. An ideal system would give to central administration the right to create a position. Thereafter a search committee would locate plausible candidates and recommend one or several to the appointing dean who would then seek ratification of that appointment from the total school faculty. Upon ratification the recommendation would be carefully reviewed by officers in central administration who would feel free to accept, reject or defer forwarding the recommendation to an all-institution committee of senior faculty. That group would also, using strict qualitative criteria, reject, defer or forward recommendation to the president who would also have discretion of decision.

The matter of faculty recruitment is stressed because systematic recruitment seems to be avoided in hundreds of institutions in which either a department head has power to recommend or an academic dean/vice president has similar power, with no real constraints placed by central administration. Increasingly in institutions maintaining off-campus centers the power to recruit and appoint faculty resides with the center's director. Especially during the 1980s and

90s when an oversupply of qualified faculty can be expected, every institution, even remotely concerned with academic quality, ought to strengthen its processes for faculty/personnel policy.

Although because so much of an academic operating budget is devoted to fixed expenditures of salaries, benefits and energy, in typical budgets there is relatively little discretionary money. However, for what there is and for re-examination of fixed expenditures, presidents and central administration properly should invoke qualitative criteria in reaching decisions. This means that budget requests should always contain alternative ways of meeting programmatic needs and should always contain qualitative program argument in support of the budget request. Saying this sounds almost like a truism; however, it seems warranted in view of rather general failure of central administrative insistence on such information and faculty uneasiness when such requirements are made. Reflection on the tensions at Boston University during the 1970s leads to the belief that it was President John Silber's insistence that schools attend to qualitative considerations which led to faculty anger. In this connection one of the important side effects from an institution adopting a computer-based simulation model system is that it makes possible requiring all budget requesting units to examine the consequences of alternative decisions.

One of the more vexing conditions stemming from the late 1950s was the disintegration of the structure of undergraduate curricula and a virtual end to any overarching institutional intellectual integration. General education requirements became, in the words of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, a disaster area, and the actual substance of the curriculum had become for the most part the province of individual academic departments. Some of these did attend to breadth and depth considerations, but the impression persists that curricular structure fundamentally consisted of expressions of the idiosyncratic interests of individual faculty members. One way open for presidents of even large and complex universities to attend to academic quality is to expend some of the limited supply of presidential persuasiveness with faculties on reasserting some overall rationale for undergraduate graduation requirements. Some of the strong presidents of the past were able to do just that and it is suggested that others could do so in the future. Although actual presidential discretion in decision making is limited, nonetheless presidents are important people and are listened to concerning at least a limited number of matters. If a president of a reasonably secure institution were to decide that a major curriculum revision was to be of highest priority the odds are that the president could bring about a change with at least some lasting results. Unfortunately, all too frequently institutional leadership will ceremonially use the rhetoric of curricular change but will not follow up that rhetoric with institutional action.

This last remark does not imply lack of value to rhetoric. Indeed, presidents who have continuously stressed academic quality in remarks to various constituencies and in writing can thereby personify high academic value and over time manage to lead an institution toward higher qualitative levels. Father Theodore Hesburgh has, for example, presided over a significant change in the University of Notre Dame, moving it to its generally accepted position as pre-eminent among Catholic universities. Father Hesburgh did many things, but of special importance was his leadership style which argued eloquently for the compatibility of intellectual excellence and Catholicity. An important characteristic of an institution possessing academic quality is that there is a generally shared value of quality. Institutional leadership would seem to be well situated to cultivate such a shared belief.

Another important rhetorical opportunity would be for presidents to become more active participants in national and international forums and to assert repeatedly academic values. Far too frequently the most widely publicized writers on collegiate matters are people occupying such marginal positions as professors of higher education, directors of institutional research, staff members in various professional organizations, or an occasional economist or sociologist writing briefly about academic matters. It might be salutary if more and more college and university presidents would take the time needed to reflect on the overall academic condition than to write and speak about it. Not only might such action contribute to a national debate, but could also lend force to a president's efforts to lead his or her institution. The plausibility of this recommendation is suggested by the publication in the early 1960s of the enormously influential volume The Uses of the University written by Clark Kerr then President of the University of California.

Obviously academic quality requires adequate financing and equally obviously gaining needed funds is a clear presidential responsibility. It would be inappropriate here to go into the complex processes of financing higher education, either for public or private institutions. What is important here is to integrate under the oversight of some one individual the major components of an overall institutional academic plan. Thus there should be explicit attention given to faculty recruitment and policies, the academic program or various academic programs, including indications of priority, strategies or development, physical plant plans, including when appropriate land development, and the budget cycle and process. Whether this oversight is maintained by a president or by a provost intimately attuned to presidential views depends on the institution's traditions and the general style of leadership, but some one individual should know in considerable detail all of those areas and should be able to enforce consistency of goal and effort.

In order for the college or university president to influence such things as faculty quality, program direction and quality of students, certain powers or prerogatives should be maintained or restored if they had been allowed to lapse. The first of these is position control by which every faculty position becoming vacant for whatever reason reverts to central administration with the power to reassign wherever most needed or to eliminate the position. Whatever administrative unit previously possessed the position would be required to argue a case for regaining it and that argument should be viewed in the light of all other competing arguments for faculty appointment. Although it is true that the turnover of faculty in institutions slowed during the 1970s and can be expected to slow even more during the 1980s, nonetheless within specific institutions or schools and departments within the institutions there can be dramatic opportunities for institutional redirection, as when a particularly large cohort group reaches mandatory retirement. At least several such points can be predicted with one coming in the latter 1980s when the cohort group recruited to teach veterans of World War II reach retirement and the next at the approach of the year 2000. An example would be a professional school of forty full-time faculty members of whom fifteen will reach mandatory retirement within a three-year period from 1983 to 1986. What is done with those positions can radically affect the professional school and if reassigned to other parts of the university, controlling those positions thus is a presidential imperative. The president and central administration require a clear and widely understood and accepted voice in faculty personnel decisions and that voice should be heard at every stage and not just at the last moment in the form of acquiescence or veto.

Then, too, the president needs full authority to make major administrative appointments, such as vice presidents and deans. In many respects the power of the president to appoint deans provides the president with the greatest opportunity to affect the academic destiny of the institution. Of course, there needs to be widespread consultation and legitimate search procedures, but presidents need to make abundantly clear what kinds of recommendations the search committee makes that will or will not be accepted.

Above all there should be no dilution of presidential power to make the institution's budget. Ideally budget preparation requires widespread consultation and much give and take, but ultimately the decisions are for the chief executive officer to make prior to recommending to a board of trustees and not, for example, in the province of a senate or faculty budget committee. Granting such responsibilities to college and university presidents and central administration is consistent with the governance and administrative traditions in the United States. Overly simplified, it can be argued that power to make critical decisions which influence institutional destiny can rest with the faculties, with presidents, boards of trustees and middle managers, with state or national government, and in some institutions, still, with students, at least regarding some matters. In Western European nations influential power seems to be distributed between faculties for some purposes and with national government for other purposes. Chief administrative officers and their asociates are relatively uninfluential in the United States, however, although the situation may be changing, relative to institutional administrative apparatus, faculty, and the state and national government are less influential.

Organizing Presidential Power

This condition of relative presidential strengths grew from unique and interacting roots and evolved out of a uniquely American environment. The unique roots were a lay board of trustees absolutely responsible for conducting and maintaining an institution and a president whom that board appointed, and to whom was granted considerable discretion for the actual running of an institution. The idea of a lay board of trustees seems to have originated in the medieval universities of Italy which were originally created and run by students but whose responsibilities were taken over by civil authorities when student autocracy became oppressive. City-state government in turn created what were essentially lay boards to oversee university affairs. The idea spread northward through Switzerland and ultimately into Holland and Scotland where lay control was consistent with ultimate lay control of Calvanistic Protestant churches. The idea of one individual as the sole spokesman for an entire institution seems to have originated in the office of rector of the University of Paris who was responsible for the purse strings, for convening the faculties and for certifying graduation and faculty appointment. The role was reinterpreted over time by the heads of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge and was then transplanted to the American colonies. There the two elements came together with a single or double board of trustees or overseers, and a president to whom responsibility was given. Once again the combination seems to have gained strength from its consistency with the governance of Calvanistic churches whose boards of elders assigned considerable discretion to the pastor for the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs.

The emergence of a college president responsible for virtually all college activities was a product of frontier conditions, poor transportation and communications and the lack of available professional faculty members. Especially after the Revolutionary War, as new colleges were created on the trans-Allegheny frontier, presidents acted at some distance from scrutiny by members of boards of trustees and recruited as instructors quite young and inexperienced tutors who were no match for the professional qualifications of the president. Working in isolation and with many things to do, the office of the president quickly became a variegated one in which the president built the college building, cultivated college farms, solicited the college library, recruited and enrolled students, saw to their moral development, taught the major courses, conducted necessary examinations and ultimately conferred the degrees. Quite typical was the President of Dartmouth, Eleazar Wheelock, who told ". . . of putting up the college building, his house, a sawmill, a gristmill, two barns and a mash house, besides clearing over 70 acres and raising crops of hay and corn, all in order that his college, Dartmouth, might be more nearly self-supporting. In addition, he governed the college, carried a full teaching load and preached on Sundays (Schmidt, 1930, p. 58). Over time those various functions were codified and were adopted by most institutions as they were created. Reasonably typical of what presidents were expected to do is the chapter on the president in the Laws of the University of Nashville:

> "1. To the president is committed the general superintendence of the interests and reputation of the university, which he is bound to promote and maintain by every exertion in his power.
>
> "2. He is, ex officio, president of the board of trustees, and of the faculty, when present with them, and also the administrator of their decisions in cases of discipline.
>
> "3. He has a right to be present at the recitation of any class of institution as often as he may see proper, and to conduct or hear recitation if chose.
>
> "4. He will take such branches of instruction into his own hands as he may judge that the number of other teachers and the exigencies of the institution shall render necessary and expedient.
>
> "5. All the religious exercises and studies of the unive sity are committed to his direction: and the other members of the faculty are required to render him such assistance as may be deemed necessary to the punctual and faithful discharge of their duties.
>
> "6. He is to preside at examinations and commencements, and to confer all degrees."
>
> (Ibid, p. 54.)

Presidents continued to do those things almost singlehandedly throughout much of the nineteenth century, until enrollments began to expand and institutions became more complex. Then presidents began to create subordinate offices, such as the Dean of the College Faculty for Harvard which was created in 1870. "The Dean of the College Faculty is appointed by the Corporation, with the consent of the Board of Governors, from among the members of the faculty. It is his duty to preside at the meetings of the faculty in the absence of the president; to administer the discipline of the college; to take charge of all petitions from undergraduates to the faculty; to keep the records of admission and matriculation; to furnish such lists of students as may be required by the faculty or the several teachers; to prepare all scales of scholarship, and preserve the records of conduct and attendance, to submit each year to the faculty lists of persons to be recommended for scholarships and beneficiary aid, and likewise a list of those who appear, from the returns made to his office, to have complied with all the regular conditions for the degree of bachelor of arts; and in general to superintend the clerical and administrative business of the college" (Dibden, 1968, p. 7).

From that office flowed over the variety of administrative subspecialites such as dean of men, dean of admissions, dean of the faculty, dean of administration, registrar and academic dean. Although new assistants were gradually appointed that did not dimish presidential responsibility for all activities, nor the willingness of presidents to exercise those responsibilities. It was that model of a dominating president which would be emulated by the great entreprenurial presidents of the late 19th century through whose leadership would be changed for all time the face and complexion of higher education. In very similar ways Andrew Dickson White at Cornell, James Burrill Angell of Michigan, and Daniel Coit Gilman first of the University of California and then of Johns Hopkins University, all converted the historic role of, for the most part, benevolent authoritarianism into positions of great prestige and authority well respected by other leadership in society and able to establish their imprint on the academic undertakings of their institutions. But the personification of a strong educational officer was William Rainey Harper who, with the financial backing of John D. Rockefeller, built the University of Chicago almost to his own design and in his own image. He decided on the design of buildings and of the educational program; he established and maintained institutional priorities which stressed the primacy of research and insured the financial vitality of the institution. While he perceived the importance of an independent faculty to guide the curriculum, nonetheless he insured that it was done in conformity to his ideas. His concerns were catholic as ". . . in a note he would propose a scholarly journal to a professor. He would review the thought of an educational scheme in a quarterly convocation statement. He would make a trip East to secure new members for the faculty. He alone was sure that the year-end deficit would somehow be taken care of" (Frodin, 1950, p. 26).

To the ideal of presidential omnipotence, exemplified by the entrepreneurial presidents of the 19th century were added several other elements, adding to the authoritarian centrality of the college or university president. Regardless of type of institution, the model of a paternalistic and authoritarian public school superintendent became the model for normal schools turned into teachers colleges and in time became models for public junior colleges whose presidents typically had been public school superintendents. In the church-related colleges, especially Catholic colleges, the quite considerable authority of heads of religious orders were simply adapted to college affairs as the head of the sponsoring order became the head of the sponsored college or university. Another strand of potential influence on the role of college president is more difficult to document, although Thorston Veblin came to believe it was predominant. This was the ideal of the corporate president, wielding great power from the office itself, with that influence reinforced and intensified through an hierarchical bureaucracy. Certainly 20th century presidents, notably Chancellor Litchfield of the University of Pittsburgh, sought to model his administration after the corporate ideal.

By the end of World War I the role of a college or university president had emerged containing elements of authoritarian small college presidents, entrepreneurial presidents who, with adequate financial backing, created a new kind of institution, public school principals and superintendents who considered faculty members as quite interchangeable parts, religious leaders who felt paternalistically responsible for all of their flock, whether individuals were faculty, students, or workers, and corporate executives accustomed to having their commands carried out by a well organized bureaucracy. Since increasingly presidents came from the ranks of the professoriate they understood faculty points of view and recognized faculty contributions to academic values. Thus they did provide for consultation with faculties and created organizations for the expression of faculty opinion. However, overall, college and university presidents viewed themselves as being individually responsible for their institutions and competent and able to decide on all issues, great and small. Such a self-image is illustrated by a cluster of 20th century presidents who singlehandedly produced profound changes in their institutions.

Arthur Morgan of Antioch College and James Madison Woods of Stephens College each became president when their institutions were in serious decline and facing bankruptcy and closure. Each had definite educational ideas and sublime confidence in his own wisdom and judgment. They each quickly eliminated board of trustee members who were unsympathetic with their vision for their institutions for the future. They each personally selected new board members and each undertook faculty recruitment as an essential presidential prerogative. Thus James Madison Woods sought interesting faculty members who shared his beliefs regardless of the possession of particular academic credentials. They each felt free to create radical new programs and to staff them, even at the expense of, and over the opposition of, the teaching faculties. Morgan singlehandedly created the cooperative work-study program under which all students would alternate between academic work on campus and supervised work experience off campus. Wood saw that admissions was the key to the role he had in mind for Stephens and created perhaps the first elaborate admissions office with admissions counselors working in all parts of the country selling the educational program he had in mind. Illustrative of the behavior of both would be the several decisions President Woods made without consultation which would become unthinkable for a president to do by the 1970s. He felt free to appoint a consultant with instructions to design a full, new curriculum for Stephens College. He also would cancel all classes for a day if he believed campus morale was declining. He would tour the country searching for compatible new faculty members and would make an appointment on the spot whenever he found someone who appealed to him, and he maintained with equinimity relatively high salaries for his immediate administrative associates and markedly low salaries for his aging faculty.

Coming into office a few years later than Woods and Morgan, Robert M. Hutchins demonstrated a similar pattern of behavior in essence but different in some detail because of the difference between an essentially teaching institution and a research university. The University of Chicago had from its creation emphasized research and advanced graduate education and for the most part tolerated undergraduate education, with some faculty hoping that it would eventually be removed from the university. The subject of reform of undergraduate education at Chicago had been discussed repeatedly under several different presidents without very much happening. That changed, however, when Robert M. Hutchins became president and announced in his inaugural address in 1929 his intention to bring about change. Throughout the succeeding ten years, although Hutchins worked through existing faculty and policy-discussing groups, he managed to transform the undergraduate program at Chicago and to present to the nation a significant educational experiment. Hutchins clearly believed that he was the executive head of the university in all its departments, exercising such supervision and direction as would promote the efficiency of every department. In that capacity he recommended and quickly gained approval of a radical reorganization of the structure and administration of the university as an initial first step in generating a significant curricular reform. Without going into great detail of his accomplishments, they included the creation of a lower division college embracing the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, a division of the rest of the university into four divisions, the creation of a prescribed program in general education as the chief effort of the college, the creation of a board of examiners which would prepare externally examinations upon which the award of academic credit would be based, the creation of a new administrative office, that of dean of students, and in time created a faculty for the college separate from the faculties of the academic departments and divisions. All of these developments were significantly different from prevailing practice and from the attitudes and beliefs of many members of the Chicago faculty. Yet Hutchins was able to reach decisions about all of them, decisions which later presidents would have judged to be more than the prerogative of the presidency could achieve. Hutchins believed he should generate reform; he believed his educational ideas were valid; he believed he knew better than anyone what kinds of individuals should be appointed to relevant administrative and professorial positions and he was willing to confront faculty opposition intellectually and to use the influence of his office and his support from the board of trustees to gain victory. While Hutchins was to remark much later, after having left Chicago, that he probably had moved too rapidly to insure that his reforms would last, nevertheless, at the time he acted clearly in the tradition of leadership exerted by the first president, Harper, and with the belief that the role he assumed, vis-a-vis faculty was a proper one. The elements of the Hutchins presidency were an imposing physical presence, a strong support from the board of trustees, an educationally informed mind, a powerful and prolific pen when addressing educational ideas, a belief in his own ability to select people, and his willingness to use a full range of administrative sanctions to obtain approval for what he wanted done.

Julian McPhee, President of the California State Polytechnic College from 1949 to 1966, was almost an archtype of the strong influential college president, demonstrating an ability to create according to his own ideas. California polytechnic College, although nominally one of the California State Colleges, had a different set of purposes and even a different name, which were maintained in spite of powerful pressures to make it conform to other state colleges. It was to provide mental and manual training in the arts and sciences, including agriculture, mechanics, engineering, business methods, domestic economy and other fields which would prepare students for non-professional walks of life. It was to serve the entire state rather than just a region as did the other state colleges. California Polytechnic College was to epitomize vocational education in the State and throughout the McPhee presidency, never foresook that vocational goal for other educational missions.

The fixity of purpose was maintained by President McPhee through an untiring capacity for work and attention to every detail of his institution through a political base in the State legislature established through years of cultivation, through keeping in sharp focus a specific educational goal, and through a willingness to decide everything which pertained to his institution. He was described variously by those who knew him. He was to some people a perfect example of the strong, directive type of administrator who had certain definite ideas about the way in which a college should be structured and the way in which a curriculum should be structured; and he saw to it that his will prevailed. He had wires out to everything that was going on on the campus, every decision that was made about anything of importance was made by him. He built up a cadre of younger administrators, and when anyone of them defied him or threatened to rise to a position to where he though his authority would be challenged, there would be sudden and ruthless shifts in personnel. "He believed in administering with a strong hand. He tried to be considerate of people, but he did not believe in wasting a lot of time talking about things that were not necessary to discuss." ". . .he chose most of his faculty personally and, therefore, placed a high premium on their absolute loyalty to the polytechnic idea. It was not until the late 1950s that he even allowed tenure policy to be instituted. He also feared the external influence of an organization--be it the State personnel board or the American Association of University Professors--which might in any way confine or influence his ability to take immediate and direction action. He always had a concern about any law or regulation which might threaten his autonomy and that of the college" (Moody, 1968, pp. 161-163).

Another California president who also personified the zenith of presidential influence in American higher education was J. Wallace Sterling, President for nineteen years of Stanford University. His major achievement was to move Stanford University from a position as a strong regional institution to a position among the most outstanding research universities, and to do so in a relatively short time. Sterling brought with him to Stanford a relatively straightforward set of beliefs. He saw private higher education as an intellectual mainstay of the society which could best be accomplished through intellectually stronger and stronger faculties, through more and more able students, through a steadily increasing variety of programs made possible through constantly expanding resources. While he had great respect for faculties and argued that faculties were essential in directing institutional affairs, he nonetheless saw himself as being able to chart the direction the institution should take and to make those decisions necessary to propel the institution in that direction. His administrative style was relaxed and informal and involved a great deal of informal consultation with those in whom he had confidence. While he did not object to formal faculty structures, he believed he could accomplish more through the relatively small group of associates with whom he surrounded himself. He trusted his own judgment about people and made appointments for people who shared his vision for the institution. Thus he appointed Frederick Terman as provost and supported Terman's effort radically to upgrade faculty members. He also trusted his own perceptions of changing conditions which led him to increase selectivity of students, move a medical school from San Francisco to the Stanford campus, create an office in Washington which could help exploit expanding federal programs for the benefit of Stanford, undertake a major restudy of undergraduate education, create a long-range plan by which his goals could be realized and began strengthening fund raising activities which would ultimately place the institution among the most successful top two or three institutions in the country. During Sterling's administration Stanford moved from adequacy to superiority in quality of faculty, quality of students, receipt of federal contracts, yield from private benefaction, effectiveness of management and research productivity. Behind each of these achievements lay decisions and labor of the president, without which the accomplishments very likely would simply have not been possible.

One biographer caught the essence of the Sterling administration, noting that ". . . the strength of leadership at Stanford during the postwar period served as a catalyst in the dynamics of institutional change. The activities and accomplishments of Sterling's administration effectively transformed the nature and reputation of Stanford University as reflected in the characteristics of the goals, personnel, curricula and organization of the institution. In assessing Stanford's potential, Sterling articulated financial and academic goals which envisioned the institution entering the first ranks of American universities. Achieving these goals entailed an aggressive approach to fund raising and an active pusuirt of an expanded institution mission through the development of research activities, graduate and professional programs, and the qualitative improvement of undergraduate education. In this quest for academic excellence, primary emphasis was placed on the improvement of faculty quality through sustained efforts to increase levels of compensation and through intensive recruitment activities. Continuing attention to the appropriateness of organizational structures was also an important element of Sterling's program for Stanford. The accumulative effect of these activities produced a valued climate that reinforced transition toward academic distinction as a major university of national prestage and drawing power" (Medeiros, 1979, pp. 269-270).

This same strong sort of presidential leadership was not restricted to the large well-known institutions. During the 1950s Leland Medsker created the Diablo Valley campus in the Contra Costa Junior College District and made it quite unique among California junior colleges from the standpoint of a well-contrived program in general education , a vigorous advising system and a climate in which academic matters were freely discussed. Benjamin Mays and Stephen J. Wright were but two of a cluster of strong Black presidents who not only left a lasting impression on the institutions over which they presided but also influenced in significant ways the national discourse about the purposes of higher education, especially as they pertained to the aspirations of Black Americans. Presidents Park, Bunting and Macintosh were all distinguished women leaders in American higher education and the institutions over which they presided maintained coherent, demanding curricula comparable to those found in the academically elite male and co-educational institutions.

The argument this chapter makes is that strong campus presidents can make a significant difference in the intellectual quality of their institutions, provided they are granted the prerogative necessary to govern. The principle danger to this argument is that those needed prerogatives might equally well be obtained by presidents who would use those powers to make consistent mistakes leading to serious campus problems and deterioration. Chancellor Leitchfield of the University of Pittsburgh attempted during the 1950s to revolutionize that institution and move it to the front rank of American universities. Unfortunately, he attempted to do too many things at once and allowed expenditures seriously to outstrip income so that by the time he left the chief executive office the institution was so seriously in debt that it had to appeal to the State of Pennsylvania for financial assistance and the status of a state affiliated institution. The answer to this problem lies in allowing presidents a great deal of power but at the same time providing sufficient checks so that power is not used in ways destructive to the institution. It can be theorized that collegiate institutions in the United States operate on the same system of checks and balances which has allowed both State and Federal government to function with only a few true impasses in over 200 years. Within colleges and universities faculties tend to be rather conservative with respect to educational change and innovation, while principal administrative officers tend to be somewhat liberal with respect to such matters, constantly searching for new ways of improving their institutions. If an institution has a strong faculty having accumulated over time a variety of prerogatives, and a relatively weak or ineffective president, the institution is likely to stagnate because of the inherent conservative reluctance to change which characterizes faculties. On the other hand, a weak and ineffectual faculty in the presence of a strong driving president may very well attempt so many changes as to seriously unsettle institutional effectiveness. In an ideal situation there would be strong faculties and strong presidents functioning in a condition of creative tension which allows for reasonable change but not too much change. Now obviously, two opposing power valances may produce impasse and confrontation, a danger which is mediated by the unique role of boards of trustees which can step in and eliminate the impass by any of the large variety of actions which the boards charter allows it. It is this system of checks and balances on which reliance must be placed to prevent central administrative leadership from making grievous errors of judgment and decision.

Decline of Presidential Power

The strength and influence of the campus presidency began seriously to decline almost simultaneously with the entry of American higher education into its most luxuriant era. In many respects a chief reason for that decline was the success of strong presidents building institutions according to their own vision of academic excellence in a variety of programs produced by able faculties using increased resources to teach steadily increasingly able students. As faculty talent increased faculty members wished a greater role in institutional affairs and were less inclined to accept without question presidential decisions. President Sterling could appoint Provost Terman after brief consultation with a few senior faculty members. President Lyman was constrained to use an elaborate search mechanism, including faculty and students to find an acceptable provost. Presidents Hannah and Hutchins could gain approval for radically new curriculums by using the powers of personality and office to persuade deans, department heads and senior professors. Their successors were forced to watch university-wide curricula proposals disappear into the maelstrom of senatorial discussion. Presidents Woods, Morgan, Hannah and McPhee could personally recruit and appoint faculty members, with that privilege being withdrawn when faculty members themselves felt their insight into academic quality was greater and more appropriate than that of the chief executive officer.

There were also other forces, well known, which can be quickly summarized. The very doubling or tripling of the size of institutions meant that presidents experienced difficulty using personal persuasion on a few individuals to achieve significant change. Before President Hannah took leave to become Deputy Secretary of Defense he saw no reason to have vice presidents, since he saw himself perfectly able to handle their affairs himself. On his return from Washington, Michigan State University had grown so large that his personal style was no longer feasible and a tier of vice presidents had to be created, although he continued to oversee the work of the deans of the various colleges. Increased size and complexity in the public sector produced multicampus institutions, state-wide coordinating agencies and state-wide systems of control, all of which absorbed in one way or another powers and prerogatives which previously had been reserved for the chief executive officer of a campus. Presidents of California State Colleges before 1960 could appoint their personally selected deans and department heads. After the creation of a systems office such appointments could not be made without review by the Chancellor's office.

Paralleling the growth of supra campus mechanisms of control came shifts in the size and nature of academic departments. In earlier times, with some notable exceptions, department heads were appointed and saw themselves as being responsible through their deans to the campus president and expected to facilitate proposals of that individual. As deparments grew and as their members saw themselves increasingly responsible to the department and to a discipline or field, the department headship changed from being accountable to an administrative heirarchy to being chiefly accountable to their own faculty members. In a very tangible way the 1960s saw powers of a campus president devolve upward to systems offices and downward to disciplinary departments.

The magnitude of those structural shifts was intensified by two other events or developments. The first of these was the relatively sudden culmination of long-developing efforts by faculties at some institutions to gain full control over their own membership and the full range of their own professional activities. Faculty members had long claimed such prerogatives and skillful administrators had rhetorically conceded them to them. However, in actuality, presidents did make or influence faculty appointments, establish teaching loads and grant or withhold tenure according to their own criteria and judgment. By the 1960s faculties in research universities especially, and to a large extent prestige colleges, successfully insisted upon the right to recruit and recommend new appointments, to determine their own use of time and to evaluate in departments their own performance. In the 1940s and 50s faculty members would request permission to be gone from a campus for a few days. In the early 1960s they would inform their superiors of an anticipated absence and by the end of that decade would feel compelled to report absence only when it would likely be more than a week or so. Obviously this academic revolution did not extend to all types of institutions. Faculty members in public community colleges and state colleges remained administratively supervised as did faculties in less prestigious private colleges. However, even in those institutions the revolutionary goal of faculty autonomy was valued with the substance frequently to be gained through unionism and collective bargaining.

The other development was the outbreak of student disruption and dissent between 1964 and 1970. Those events most certainly ended institutional, hence presidential power over the personal conduct of students. In 1958 the president of Stephens college could and did expell students for becoming pregnant. The central administration at Stanford could regulate residence hall hours for women, student dress and could prohibit the use of alcohol. Ten years later no such actions were possible, but even more significant from the standpoint of deterioration of presidential power was the creation of faculty senates as one device for coping with student unrest. While prior to the 1960s a few institutions such as the University of California had faculty senates, most did not. There typically was a large and unwieldy total faculty which could deliberate about such matters as graduation requirements and approval of new courses, but which was too large to express a continuing voice concerning the full range of campus affairs. In institution after institution the large total faculty proved to be unable to respond to student demands. As institutions perceived the lack of an effective faculty mechanism to cope with crisis that perception coupled with long smoldering faculty desire for a greater formal voice in setting instituional policy, led to the creation of senates either representing only the teaching faculty or the various constituencies of a campus. Senatorial curtailment of presidential prerogative varied among institutions and types of instituions with the most predominant provisions being senate committee oversight of appointment, retention, promotion and tenure, budget preparation, and changes in virtually all policies affecting the internal affairs of campuses. During the late 1950s President Sterling could establish a long-range plan for Stanford without even consulting with deans or the total faculty. By the 1970s all planning activities were routinely reported to the senate and approval requested, except for the actual final substance of a budget.

These factors alone were sufficient to reduce considerably the power, prerogatives and influence of campus presidents. However, that slippage was aggravated by the generally deteriorating regard for leadership during the 1970s. Throughout the entire nation military leadership came to be viewed as antagonistic to the national good, corporate leadership as destructive to the environment and national political leadership as venal, corrupt and self-serving. While the leadership of higher education suffered less loss of public confidence than did the leadership of all other social institutions, save medicine, nonetheless, the proportion of the public expressing confidence in the leaders of higher education slipped from 61 percent in 1966 to 33 percent in 1979 (Levine, 1980, p. 12). That loss of confidence beyond doubt reduced discretion available to presidents and their associates.

Possibly causal with respect to declining presidential power, but more likely mirroring change are theories and pronouncements regarding the nature of the presidency. Beginning in the late 50s came a series of pronouncements, alleging or advocating a decline in presidential influence. Ruml and Morrison set the tone in 1959, arguing that the president had lost the power to influence education because of the increased complexity of presidential duties, that the faculty was unable to influence education because of its conservatism and fragmentation into departments. They argued that only the board of trustees could view dispassionately educational needs with enough authority to produce needed changes (Ruml and Morrison, 1959). Clark Kerr observed that the role of the president of a comprehensive university had deteriorated to that of a mediator between the demands of the various quasi autonomous units which comprised what he called the multiuniversity. Kenneth Galbraith repeatedly contended that it was the faculty which rightfully should control institutions and that administrators, including presidents, existed to conform to the will of the faculty. But perhaps the most influential statement is that expressed by Cohen and March who observed "The presidency is an illusion. Important aspects of the role seem to disappear on close examination. In particular, decision making in the university seems to result extensively from a process that decouples problems and choices and makes the president's role more commonly sporadic and symbolic than significant. Compared to the heroic expectations he and others might have, the president has modest control over the events of college life. The contributions he makes can easily be swamped by outside events or the diffused qualities of university decision making" (Cohen and March, 1974, p. 2). They proceeded to affirm that such impotence derives from the very essence of a collegiate institution as an organized anarchy unclear of its goals, possessing no technology for goal achievement and lacking valid means for evaluating outcomes.

Consequences of Decline of Presidential Power

Three major questions should be asked and answered. What have been the significant consequences of a decline in presidential power? Have those consequences for the most part been beneficial or hurtful and should the condition of decline be reversed? If they should be reversed are there plausible and realistic ways to do so?

Possibly of greatest consequence, if it can be established, is the deterioration and fragmentation of the undergraduate curriculum. In the past the great and lasting curricular innovations were for the most part introduced and established by presidents willing to expend a substantial portion of their good will to accomplish educational purposes. Thus President Charles W. Eliot, despite cautions from his board, proclaimed in his inaugural address his belief in the elective system which was well in place within six years. As noted previously Arthur E. Morgan introduced cooperative work-study as an essential element of the Antioch College curriculum and was able to institutionalize it. Several decades later Asa Knowles as President did the same thing at Northeastern University. The most visible and lasting formal programs of general education at Chicago, Minnesota and Michigan State University were the products of presidential effort.

Since the early 1960s there have been no reformulations of undergraduate education comparable in magnitude to general education and the various reforms suggested have for the most part proven to be transitory, or acceptable only to marginal institutions. This would include such things as non-traditional programs and external degrees, competency-based education, experiential education, individual self-paced learning, and interdisciplinary problem-oriented seminars. Now and then a highly visible college or university president will speak out in favor of some reformulation of undergraduate education and presidents of liberal arts colleges will frequently publish speeches in the magazine Liberal Education urging a return to some variation of the liberal arts and sciences. However, the principal argument for curricular reformulation comes from such people as Paul L. Dressel, K. Patricia Cross, Arthur Levine, Arthur Chickering, or Morris Keeton, all without position or political power to effect the changes they propose.

The dynamics of this absence of significant curricular revision are quite easy to portray in large institutions from five to fifty thousand students. Each of the various schools and departments have their own interests, loyalties and styles which they pursue with little oversight by either central administration or by faculty senate. Each of those units seem typically to have resolved the dilemma as to whether they are agents to the university or agents of their school or department in favor of the smaller organization, and presidents either no longer have or are no longer willing to use the range of administrative sanctions of promotion or non-promotion for programmatic reasons, appointment to administrative positions of individuals charged with carrying out presidential recommendations, appointing committees of like-minded individuals or differential salary changes. Established salary schedules, union contracts, specified review procedures for faculty personnel action, specified search procedures for academic administrators, union contracts, program constraints imposed by supra institutional boards, or in some institutions, administrative adoration of the faculty, prevent exercise of sactions. Now it may be that institutions are better off but there is a trade-off between administrative discretion and institutional program building.

A second consequence of power and prerogative moving from a president to supra campus boards and headquarters, to subordinate schools and departments, to senates and elaborate systems of faculty committees and to students, is increased demand placed on presidential time. With each new element added to the institutional power formula the amount of consultation and reporting increases to the point that institutional leadership spends the bulk of its time checking with various relevant constituencies before reaching a decision. With time scheduled so tightly and spent shifting from one potentially hostile conversation to another, the opportunities for reflection on educational matters and for designing educational programs virtually disappear. It is probably this lack of time of modern college and university presidents which has prevented them from writing such thoughtful educational works as Robert M. Hutchins, The Higher Learning; Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University; Harold Taylor, On Freedom and Education; A. Whitney Griswold, In the University Tradition, or the various writing of James B. Conant, concerning science, college education and secondary education.

A third potential consequence of loss of discretion could be that capable, imaginative individuals will come to find the role of the president so frustrating as to make it undesirable. People seek to become presidents for reasons of status and income, a desire to influence events, an opportunity to make a contribution, a feeling that they are better able than others to direct a complex organization, or because of a presumed liking to work with faculties and other interesting people. As the role of the president diminishes in influence the opportunities to satisfy those desires becomes attenuated. As of 1981 there was no evidence that a shift in quality of those becoming presidents had taken place. However, thoughtful groups such as the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education suggest a strong likelihood of it happening.

An occasional consequence in those institutions which adopted a senate and committee structure which excluded administrative participation, was that central administrative voice would not really be heard until the point of final decision. Prior to the 1960s in all types of institutions presidents and central administration played a major role (frequently too significant a role) in the recruitment and appointment of faculties and in some institutions an influential posture is still maintained. The recruitment process at Stanford University, for example, begins with a department or school request to the provost for a specific position, the dimensions of which are clearly indicated in the request. The provost and staff review those requests critically and may grant them, reject them, or ask for substitute modifications. After a search procedure a dean or department head upon recommendation of their faculties makes formal recommendation to the provost who reviews it and who may approve, deny, defer or ask for a still broader search. If approved the recommendation is reviewed by an elected advisory board to the president and if the board approves the recommendation it goes to the president who usually recommends it to the board, but who may elect other options. Thus central administrative opinion is substantively expressed three times. That same general procedure is also for promotion and granting of tenure. Such a procedure contrasts sharply with that used in Stanislaus State College, one of the system of California state colleges. There a recommendation for promotion is made by a department. The recommendation is then forwarded to an elected faculty committee on appointment, retention, promotion and tenure. This committee, which has no administrative representatives, reviews the recommendation and if it approves the recommendation, forwards it to the academic vice president who may approve or deny; however, by the time a recommendation reaches the vice presidential desk there is already considerable faculty vested interest and every denial becomes a potential spark for faculty-administration confrontation and indeed in that institution confrontation was a major fact of institutional life for over a decade.

A substantial consequence of loss of campus central administrative power and authority appears to be an increase in frequency and intensity of confrontation between faculty and administration, especially if a president seeks aggressively to restore administrative prerogative. This phenomenon was dramatically demonstrated at Michigan State University which, as previously described, had flourished under the paternalistic leadership of President John Hannah for almost thirty years. Toward the end of his regime, departments, schools, institutes, the faculty senate and students had begun to exert considerable independence from the administration and had refused to go along with a major set of curricular reform measures similar to those which had readily been enacted during the height of his leadership. Hannah was succeeded by Clifton Wharton, a pleasant and intelligent man who saw no reason to re-establish a strong presidential role. Nor were administrative prerogatives of critical concern to Edgar Hardin who, after retirement from another presidency, served as an interim president for 18 months. The board of trustees finally appointed M. Cecil Mackey who, in his two preceding positions as president of the University of South Florida and President of Texas Tech, had been able to rule autocratically and to make major administrative and curricular changes because the faculties were neither particularly strong nor particularly organized to resist. Mackey immediately began to reorganize the administration of Michigan State and to replace many administrators with new people whom he liked, frequently picking associates who were southerners like himself. However, the very abruptness of his changes alienated such important constituencies as the academic council, the athletic department, the alumni, the legislature and perhaps half of the faculty. It is irrelevant here to go into the many events of controversy, except to point out that the campus became so polarized that some thoughtful individuals seriously questioned the institution's survival.

Among all of the previous real or potential consequences of diminished power and influence of central administration, the most important is the potential for geniune decline in academic or intellectual quality. In considering this matter it is essential to establish some definition or criteria of quality. As a first step the ideas on quality expressed in Chapter I can be epitomized by paraphrasing Eric Ashby who, commenting on the purposes of higher education, remarked ". . . not by discussing non-cognitive, affective approaches to experience, these approaches are an essential ingredient of living, and institutions of higher education should provide opportunities for them as they do for physical recreation and for catering, but they should be part of the social environment of a college, not its narrow, social purpose; that (I believe) ought to be confined to the cognitive rational approach to experience, simply because that is what the teachers are competent to teach" (Ashby, 1974, p. 144).

In the past, campus presidents and their associates could and did have a direct influence on academic and intellectual quality, if they wished to assert it. The first and most important prerogative was strong influence over appointment, promotion, and tenure, or direct involvement in such matters. The presidents of institutions which became distinctive in the 1920s and 30s all personally selected faculty members and administrative associates to ensure consistency of educational effort. President Hannah at Michigan State personally selected deans and department heads and established criteria they were to use in expanding their faculties. One principle was to recruit large numbers of relatively young and junior faculty members, to observe their performance carefully and to terminate at the end of their appointments all who did not give strong promise of considerable achievement. In one situation, inadvertantly, forty-two assistant professors had become eligible for reappointment with tenure. When President Hannah realized that, he reappointed all for one year, and told his deans to screen them and make recommendations for promotion and tenure. Only a few met the stringent standards. At Stanford, during the 1950s, President Sterling personally selected his provost, Frederick Terman, and, together, they developed and insisted upon stringent and rigid standards to be applied as the Stanford faculty was enlarged and improved. Both individuals believed recruitment should concentrate on finding individuals of high quality and they ensured the less qualified did not slip through, by imposing increasingly rigorous standards upon the processes of faculty search and selection. Sterling added to this effort by diligently searching for increased funds to support raiding other institutions for outstanding talent. At San Francisco State College, during the 1950s, President J. Paul Leonard personally recruited faculty members of considerable ability who were sympathetic with Leonard's conception of general education as an appropriate synthesis for undergraduate education. The late 1950s and most of the 1960s were times of shortage of faculty members. They were times of high faculty mobility. In a sense, they were times of a relatively free market, in which successful entrepreneurialship could succeed brilliantly. Observing institutions as they faced that market, and reviewing their plans for development, the central role of the president and central administration was generally regarded by the people in those institutions as determining. Thus, a president was seen as having a vision of excellence, towards the achieving of which he was pressuring schools and departments to move. Central administration was seen as exerting pressures on departments to recruit carefully, as a step toward excellence. The impact of such presidential concern was most clearly seen in those institutions which significantly changed their character over a short period of ten or twelve years, such as Northeastern University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of Wisconsin--Green-Bay, Southern Illinois University, Vanderbilt University or the University of Missouri--St. Louis.

Presidents also contributed to quality through their own intellectual interests and proclivities. Thus, Smith found that institutional members of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, which made significant progress toward gaining accreditation, improving faculty salaries, increasing endowment, increasing enrollment, and expanding programs were invariably presided over by individuals who identified with the higher education community, read widely and wrote and spoke frequently about educational matters, and seemed well aware of major educational and intellectual currents. Member colleges making little or no progress were invariably presided over by presidents holding much more local and parochial interests and contacts. Several years later, Ford found the same phenomenon in dynamic and quiescent Jesuit colleges.

Now, obviously, a decline in central administrative discretion does not prevent the presidents from maintaining a strong and catholic intellectual life or a narrow and parochial one. To the extent that they do one or the other, they can continue to influence intellectual quality. The important development, however, is the decline in opportunity directly to affect administrative and professorial appointments. It should be noted that this decline was clearly beneficial in preventing imprudent presidents from making bad appointments. It is probably too early to tell whether in the long run selection and appointment procedures involving many more people and/or detailed processes will produce stronger or weaker institutions.

Restoration of Presidential Power

Given the profound changes in American higher education, there can be considerable question as to whether there can be a restoration of prerogative and influence to the leaders and central administration of individual campuses. Supra-institutional bureaucracies are a reality, and bureaucracies are not noted for dismantling themselves. Faculty senates are a reality, and while many are not particularly creative or effective, nonetheless, their existence is a constraint. Student control over their own affairs is also a reality, given effective legal legitimacy through recognition of eighteen year-olds as adults. Generally, institutions with large numbers of tenured faculty are restricted, at least for a decade or so, with respect to new faculty appointments, unions, collective bargaining, and negotiated contracts exist in over 700 institutions, and that number could grow significantly.

However, some steps might be suggested, which might affect institutional leadership. The first is a simple exhortation for campus presidents to make an effort to become less parochial in their intellectual interests and activities. As Cohen and March have told us, presidents follow very heavy schedules and seem to have little time for intellectual development; or, as mythology has it, first, stop writing; then, stop reading; and finally, stop thinking. However, such heavy schedules are probably not at all necessary, and presidents could self-deny themselves some busyness for the sake of their own intellectual expansion. It might be a good idea, for example, for every campus president to clear one full weekday a week, which could then be devoted to study, reflection, and writing. Presidents should be encouraged, not only to speak and to write about academic and intellectual concerns on their own campuses, but also to contribute to national discourse and debate about academic and intellectual issues. In February 1975, Change Magazine published results of a poll of college and university presidents, foundation executives, journalists, and government officials to nominate the most influential leaders of higher education. Out of 1400 nominations, 44 individuals were chosen on the basis of frequency of mention. Less than half of the 44 were or had been institutional presidents. Of the 17 who were, 8 gained their national reputations for influence for roles assumed after their presidencies. The hope would be that for a similar poll taken in 1995, a large majority of those selected would be campus presidents.

A second suggestion, especially for larger institutions, is to develop traditions and even policies which would move promising individuals in the institution through various ranks with full expectation that the normal course of events would see some of those so identified becoming president of the campus. At MIT such a tradition is well-established, with individuals moving from department head to dean to vice-president to president to chancellor and, finally to presidency of the board of trustees. Such a tradition seems to be emerging at Stanford, with the two most recent presidents having come up through the ranks. In the past, many presidential search-committees seemed to have operated on the premise that an outsider would be more effective than an insider, if for no other reason than that the outsider would take office relatively free of enemies and long-established blocs of opposition. However, many of the more widely-known, recent presidents came from within, and well understood the institutions over which they would preside. Examples would be Clark Kerr of the University of California, Theodore M. Hesburgh of Notre Dame, Edward H. Levi of the University of Chicago, or Father Paul C. Reinert of St. Louis University.

In a similar vein, systems of institutions, or organizations of kinds of institutions, might well begin systematic identification of, and cultivation of, individuals for future positions of leadership. For example, each of the twenty-eight Jesuit collegiate institutions might identify a promising young assistant professor to be sent to a sister institution for a year's internship in administration. For those who seemed to demonstrate administrative talents, further development activities could be provided, and the expectation cultivated that the next generation of Jesuit presidents would likely come from the ranks of those individuals. In a sense, some public systems do such a cultivation informally; what is suggested here is a more formal endeavor, including establishing firm expectations of subsequent progress for individuals.

A much less feasible suggestion is based on the rather effective system of schooling used by the military forces. In that system an infantry lieutenant who will become a general officer, must have gone through company officer courses, the Command and General Staff School, perhaps a specialized school, such as the Defense Intelligence School, and the War College. Theoretically, there could be established several such schools for future collegiate administrators, through cooperation of relevant national associations and some of the university centers or departments of higher education. Thus, the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, and some center for higher education might establish structured programs for academic deans aspiring to the presidency of liberal arts colleges. The Association of American Universities might also aid in creating programs, perhaps for as much as three months's duration, which could give deans and senior department heads some additional insights needed by those who would progress to the role of provost or president.

Such efforts should improve the search procedures for presidents. They might, over time, eliminate the "marriage made in heaven" belief which permeates so many search committees as they seek the one ideal person to lead their institution. Search committees ought to represent the various campus constituencies, operating on the assumption that they will identify perhaps twenty individuals, any one of whom would likely make an effective campus leader.

As a context for such renewed leadership to function several specific suggestions are offered. The first of these desirable arrangements is the unitary system of administrative responsibility, which makes the president alone responsible and accountable to the board of trustees. In the last part of the nineteenth century, as businessmen and lawyers began to replace clergymen on boards of trustees, some institutions adopted a dual structure, with the president and chief financial officer both responsible to the board of trustees. At Stanford, for example, the president was responsible for the academic program and the business manager for financial affairs. Gradually, the dual structure was abolished in most institutions. However, in some institutions, some elements of the dual system remained, and in still others, duality began to reappear as conditions changed.

In some liberal arts colleges, the business manager is ex officio a member of the board of trustees and serves as treasurer of the institution. It is the business manager who proposes the budget for board approval and who defends it. The president may or may not know the financial condition of the institution. In one institution, a three-way split of responsibility was adopted, with the business manager, the president, and the provost each responsible to the board of trustees, respectively, for finances, external affairs, and internal affairs. In some of the recently created private institutions that emphasize strong egalitarianism, multiple forms of administrative responsibility have been urged. The Antioch Law School in Washington, D.C., for example, was created by a husband-and-wife team and both are responsible to the board and are expected to divide duties as they see fit. The University Without Walls in Berkeley, California, assigned administrative responsibility to the executive committee of the board of trustees, with no particular portfolio assigned to each member. So confused did conditions become in that institution that major misallocations of federal funds took place with no single officer aware of what was happening. Even in well-established institutions, the external demands on the time of the chief executive officer have produced a situation in which authority for on-campus affairs simply devolved upon the vice-president-provost. This can be tolerable if the president and vice-president can work together and recognize the line beyond which the provost will not exercise power. With a less congenial relationship, the division of authority can impede essential flow of information, place the board in a position of adjudicating differences between the president and provost, and actually divide the campus into antagonistic camps.

Consistent with the concept of unitary administration is the concept of a cabinet system of administrative coordination. The president typically has several principal administrative subordinates: officers in charge of academic affairs, financial affairs, student affairs, public relations, development, and admissions. These officers should be organized into a consultative, deliberative, and decision-making body that meets regularly, recognizes its collective responsibilities, and is recognized by all campus constituencies as one of the major policy-forming agencies of the institution.

As a counterforce to administration, the faculty should be so organized that its judgment may be expressed on all issues and decisions made on those matters that come within its purview--namely, curriculum, faculty membership, entrance and graduation requirements, and some matters of student life. Faculty advice should be available with respect to institutional purpose, priorities, including financial ones, and any other matters involving the entire institution. In far too many institutions in trouble, there is no clear faculty structure and no clear understanding of faculty powers and prerogatives. Typically, there is a formal faculty, which meets monthly and debates issues and which has standing committees with no real understanding of their powers. No clear and legitimate way is provided to bring together the opinions of administration and faculty so as to produce prudent decisions. One of the first pieces of advice that should be given an institution in trouble is to create an effective and formal faculty structure. This, it should be noted, should apply to all institutions. When Columbia University faced outbreaks of student protest in the 1960s, it was discovered that there was no formal instrument that could engage the full faculty in considering the troubles of the institution.

Financial problems represent a central focus of the question of leadership. Sound financial decisions can be reached efficiently by using the insights of both faculty and administration. Consider the following example of an important but frequently ignored budgeting system.

In September, the central administration prepares and distributes a broad set of budget guidelines indicating, to the best of its ability, the likely income and possible categories of expenditure that might be expected for the next academic year. These are sent to schools and departments and to the academic senate for discussion and development of school or department budgetary needs. The chief academic officer visits with each school or department to interpret the intent of the guidelines, obtain reactions, and hear of specific problems. These meetings are followed by discussions with deans and department heads as each seeks to maximize the support for his or her unit. From these meetings emerge very specific budget guidelines, including the amount and kind of salary changes that would be acceptable. Deans and department heads then prepare their detailed-budget requests, which are consolidated and refined prior to submission to the board of trustees for approval. Once the budget requests are approved, the deans and department heads are notified so that they can plan during the summer and know, with reasonable certainty, what funds they will have during the next academic year.

A significant element of budget preparation and budget administration is determining the administrative level at which direct budget administration should be placed. In many private liberal arts colleges, budgets are administered centrally or departments are given knowledge of and authority over only small operating budgets for the purchase of supplies and a few services. Control over travel, operating capital purchases (microscopes, for example), communications, and salaries rests with the business manager. Even when funds have been budgeted for supplies to departments or divisions, many of these institutions require a second approval by the business office. The reason given for such practices is that the central administration must retain complete budgetary control if the institution is to have the flexibility to meet sudden shifts in income, as, for example, when there is an unexpected drop in enrollment. It is also argued that departments in liberal arts colleges are typically small and that decentralized information about salaries would mean that everyone would quickly know the exact salaries of everyone else. In addition, until the actual income can be known, following fall registration, there is an unwillingness to make final budget allocations that actually allow subordinate units to spend. A better system would be to assign full budgeting responsibility to whomever has full responsibility.

One of the major weaknesses of collegiate administration is that the roles and duties of administrators at the second, third, and fourth levels have been so ambiguous. Thus, department heads may be senior or junior faculty members, may be expected to serve one year or three years or indefinitely, and may be expected to attend to only administrative chores or to be closely involved in personnel decisions.

With varying degrees of emphasis, according to level of administration and type of institution, academic administrators from president down to department heads should be expected to perform a number of different duties.

- Faculty and staff development. A first essential is to facilitate the professional development of faculty. This duty would include reviewing student evaluations of faculty and faculty professional activities, counseling with individual faculty members, and making judgments regarding them that will affect their professional careers. It would also include setting up in-service training programs and other activities for the development of faculty. With regular attention to such matters, there would be little need for new offices of professional development to be created.
- Budget preparation and budget control. Budgets are really statements of educational purpose phrased in fiscal terms. Thus, budget and program responsibility should always go together.
- Advocacy. A department or division head, dean of a school, or even the

president should be an advocate of the unit he or she represents and should work to achieve adequate resources for it. A good test of the effectiveness of a department head would be the changes in budget appropriations for the department made during his or her incumbency.

- Titular Representatives. There are many different occasions when a unit must be represented by someone for both substantive and symbolic reasons. Deans sit on the platform at commencement, and department heads hold receptions for new students and faculty in the fall. When visitors or prospective students wish to find out about a program, it is the titular head to whom they go. This role not only ensures that reasonably accurate information is provided but also other faculty members are not bothered.
- Facilitation. An important duty of the heads of units is to facilitate conditions most favorable to the effectiveness of the unit. This includes taking definite steps to develop a sense of community and ensuring that faculty members have adequate offices.
- Communication. Each administrator is, in effect, a direct communication link between his or her unit and other units in the institution. Thus, department heads, meeting as part of the dean's cabinet, can report to their colleagues concerning their own units and the activities of other departments.
- Execution of policies. Administrators spend considerable time just carrying out policies developed by their faculties or at higher levels of administration. This duty ranges from acting on student requests to answering correspondence and preparing reports.
- Financial development. In institutions such as research universities,

even department heads are expected to search for funds for the department members to carry on needed or desired activities. Indeed, in some institutions, the "every tub stands on its own bottom" doctrine extends down to departments in the expectation that each department will earn enough tuition and secure enough external funds to maintain its faculty and other expenses.

What is needed for restored leadership is not the old time authoritarian style, but rather a centralized-decentralized system in which final responsibility for every matter affecting an institution rests with the president. However, responsibility for the various programs and activities are clearly assigned to subordinate officers who know what is expected of them and who are assigned sufficient power to perform. Strength of the chief executive officer can be enhanced by increasing the strength of subordinates.

CHAPTER VIII

Centralized - Decentralized Organization

Presumably, although not necessarily demonstrably, how colleges and universities are organized, administered, and governed has some relationship to academic and intellectual quality. The purpose of organization and administration is essentially to obtain the requisite resources of money, people, and equipment needed to achieve fundamental educational purpose, and, so, to orchestrate and focus those resources to ensure optimum achievement. There is a generally adopted pattern of organization, administration, and governance, to be found in virtually all collegiate institutions in the United States. Its elements are well known, and need be but briefly recalled. There are boards of trustees, having complete responsibility for an entire institution, below which is a chief executive officer, exercising the will of the board of trustees through three principle subordinates, respectively in charge of academic affairs, financial affairs, and student affairs. Depending on the size and type of institution, the chief executive officer is supported by a variety of service agencies, such as admissions, public relations, and fund raising. The subordinate officer most directly concerned with academic quality is obviously the one responsible for academic affairs. Depending on the size of the institution, typical organization provides for schools, colleges, or divisions responsible to the chief academic officer, subdivided into academic departments and special institutes. Or, in smaller institutions, departments themselves are responsible to the chief academic officer. In addition, there are a variety of support or service activities variously lodged administratively, including registrars, libraries, teaching hospitals, computer centers, and, of course, the needed arrangements to take care of finances, physical plant, and needed services to students.

The tenuousness of the relationship of structure to quality is suggested by the fact that one institution carefully organized along those lines will be recognized as concerned with academic quality, while another is judged as seriously deficient with respect to qualitative concerns. Question is also raised when quite different organizations are developed by different institutions which, nonetheless, obtain similarly qualitative achievements. Thus, Stanford University operates without an undergraduate college, while Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago maintain one, yet reputation and results are quite similar. An effort will be made to explore issues in organization, administration, and governance to determine whether or not there are warrantable assertions regarding structure having predictable qualitative consequences.

As is true for most other facets of collegiate education, there is a litany of well-developed criticisms which have persisted over time, but without producing appreciable change in facts. Thus, over time, for at least a hundred years, there has been continuous criticism of the Ph.D. as preparation for college teaching, the lecture as the common mode of college teaching, the reward system which emphasizes research and graduate education over undergraduate education, and the academic department as the principle operating administrative unit.

The endemic criticisms of collegiate organization and administration express well-rehearsed elements, with the first being that collegiate institutions have maintained an organization which evolved to achieve an educational function, but which grew to be inappropriate to achieve such added responsibilities as research and service to the larger society. The relatively straightforward organization of institutions into teaching departments, represented an effective arrangement for such a mission, but inadequate to manage large-scale research or providing significant service to a local community, state government, or federal government. Perkins elaborated this criticism in a monograph prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, replete with such observations as, "These new structures (large-scale research enterprises) have, for the most part, escaped the direct control of departments and collegiate faculties. They deal directly with top university administration for space and personnel and with outside sources for funds and, when necessary, political backing. Clearly, the department could have only minimal role in activities organized on such a scale." Or, "There are two complications in the university's assumption of this function (public service). First, public service requires institution-wide commitment, but such commitment is difficult to arrive at, given the decentralized structure of the university. Moreover, neither teaching nor scholarship operates happily or effectively when it must respond to a commitment made by the institution as a whole." "The second serious problem is the contradiction between being of service to the public and maintaining the autonomy of the institution" (Perkins, 1973, pp. 6-11). While it is possible to find extreme pathological examples of malfunction because of competing missions, a more general condition is simply tension, which can be maintained through intelligence. Thus, in a research university, some tension may be generated as faculty members pursue research, direct graduate students, consult, and educate undergraduate students. However, results have typically been far from catastrophic.

A second major criticism is essentially the same as the criticism that college teachers are not trained for their predominent role. The charge is made that academic administrators have not been formally prepared for administrative duties, and that this fact has typically produced fumbling, bumbling amateurism. The criticism implies that administration requires esoteric knowledge and precise technical skills of a high order, which can best be acquired (but rarely is) through formal training. The more typical fact is that people enter collegiate administrative roles quite well prepared through long and expanding administrative experience. Thus, an academic dean or department head arrives at that position after years of serving on and chairing committees, performing a variety of administrative tasks, serving as assistants to deans or presidents, serving as department heads, and eventually, assuming a major administrative role. It was such informally-prepared administrators who expanded American higher education during its period of enormous growth, and it is likely that individuals with typically the same sort of preparation will need to, and be able to, manage stability or even decline.

Almost as frequently criticized as the lack of preparation for collegiate administrators is the criticism of the academic department, organized on disciplinary lines. Departments are judged as appropriate to facilitate research, graduate education, and individual faculty well-being, but inappropriate to achieve institution-wide goals, including well-balanced under-graduate education. They are criticized as being overly-parochial, and as stifling such educational innovation as interdisciplinary programs. Departments are charged with placing their own interests ahead of institutional interests, and are seen to have contributed to the loss of presidential power to govern. For example, a departmental development of a doctoral program might very well be antithetical to the best use of institutional resources, and departmental preoccupation with disciplinary-specialized courses denies faculty resources for institution-wide programs of general education. Harrington epitomized the conventional criticism by remarking that, "Useful in developing disciplines, departments have championed specialization at the expense of generalizations, broad learning, and interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary studies. They have been criticized, since their beginnings...for the break-up of knowledge into pieces and...for the maiming and mutilization of the mind that comes from over-absorption in one subject....As the size of institutions increased, faculty members ---- to live their lives inside their departments, to have less to do with members of other departments, and, after helping to build institutions, by their insistence on autonomy departments have tended to pull these institutions apart, weakening the principle of college unity, the basic theory of the unidersity. Strong departments have tended to build loyalty to the discipline, rather than to the institution. Raises, promotions, and chances for better jobs have depended more on recognition in one's special field than on contributions to faculty committees or one's reputation as a teacher" (Harrington, 1977, pp. 55 & 56). Such criticusm of departments has been especially prevalent in the thinking of the radical-egalitarian reformers and in some of the more widely-publicized radical experiments of the 1960's and 1970's. For example, the planners for the University of Wisconsin, Green-Bay came to believe that the bulk of criticusm of American higher education was produced by the traditional academic department: "...it was based on a discipline; its professors normally had greater authority over programming, personnel, and budget decisions; and they had little incentive to relate their intellectual interests and programs to those of other departments. In some ways, they existed in splendid isolation, turned inward on their own concerns, and the concerns of their discipline. At most, they paid minimal attention to the world outside the university or to the interface between subject matter and society" (Weidner, 1977, p. 64). It is perhaps, relevant to note that few of the new institutions publicized by virtue of rejection of departmental organization have proven attractive to students, nor have attracted sufficient enrollment for viability. Of course, other matters may have been involved, such as location and time, however, too radical a departure from orthodoxy apparently is not unrelated to institutional vitality.

An emerging criticism of collegiate administration which is related to the question of a lack of formal preparation, is that college administration has not taken adequate advantage of new theories of management and management information. The premise is that the scientific study of organizations and the evolving precepts in graduate schools of business have developed sophisticated approaches which, if embraced and adopted, could radically improve how collegiate institutions are organized, administered, and managed. The argument is that if institutions develop better management information systems, and if they apply what is theorized about how organizations function, that institutions will be better able to mount appropriate educational programs. This point of view has a reasonably long history, with Herbert Stroup urging that strict imposition of bureaucratic principles would facilitate institutional functioning, Warren Bennis, claiming that organizational theory could be used as a basis for improved administration, and Miller, showing how at least one institution put its finances in equilibrium through sophisticated modeling. However, as March has observed, organizations succeed not by the utilization of macrotheories, but through simple competence in dealing with the trivia of day-to-day relations with clients and day-to-day problems in maintaining and operating whatever technology has been adopted: "Accomplishing these trivia may involve considerable planning, complex coordination and central direction, but it is more commonly linked to the effectiveness of large numbers of people doing minor things competently." James G. March, How We Talk and How We Act (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1981) p. 17.

A perennial criticism of collegiate administration, especially of the role of chief executive officer, which is supported by two distinct lines of argument and two distinct conclusions, is that collegiate administrators are extraordinarily busy with the details of the office. One argument is that the demands on presidents, deans, and vice-presidents are so demanding, yet so essential, that the work really can never be completely done. The other argument is that presidents, deans, and vice-presidents are extremely busy because they want to be busy, and see activity as evidence that they are performing their jobs satisfactorily. Regardless of the origin of busy-ness, examples abound of collegiate administrators spending long hours at their jobs and assuming responsibility for virtually every detail under their purview. There is the dean who felt obliged to reach his office at 4 o'clock every morning, to handle the desk-work so that the normal office-hours of 8 'til 5 or 6 could be spent talking with people. There was the example of an academic dean in a liberal-arts college who felt obligated to serve actively on twenty-one different committees, as well as over-seeing sixteen departments, the library, the registrar's office, the separate school of chiropractic medicine and who also insisted upon teaching a course for undergraduate students. Still another dean reversed the matter, attending to paper work until 6 each evening and desk-work from 6 until 10 or 11 each night. The alleged consequence of such hyper-activity is that administrators end up having no time to devote to their two principle obligations -- exerting educational leadership and facilitating the development of the professoriat. The implication, of course, is that educational quality very likely suffers from the sheer demands of managing even relatively small institutions.

A different kind of criticism is that collegiate organization, with power residing in boards of trustees, presidents, deans, directors, and department heads, is essentially undemocratic, because it denies significant governance roles to the two largest constituencies on campus -- students and staff. It is argued that if students could have a stronger role, the educational program would likely become more relevant to their needs, hence, more significant and of better quality. A few institutions have tried to accommodate that criticism through creating university senates, in which all campus constituents, including students, have legitimate representation.

A different point of view can contradict virtually all of those standard criticisms. While there are many examples of incompetent people becoming collegiate administrators (as would also be true in banking, business, and the military) the overall record of collegiate administration, developed chiefly through an informal sense of experiences, has been reasonably good. Institutions have grown, have acquired requisite resources, have responded to emerging needs of the society, have produced the needed professional and technical manpower, and have produced graduates not seriously dissatisfied with their education or the lives they lead as adults. The serious criticisms leveled at higher education performance, and upon which demands for organizational reform are based, can, for the most part, be attributed to factors other than institutional failure. The 60-year old attrition rate of 50% is probably more related to unrealistic expectations of many entering freshmen, than to institutional failure. The disinterest of many Americans in high culture, even on the part of college graduates, is also probably more related to historic strands in American character, than to failure of educational of educational institutions. Similarly, changing social values, ethical standards, and possible loss of civility are much too profound developments to be attributed to any one social institution, especially to a social institution essentially of important, but limited, purpose.

To review and contradict the litany of criticism, the informal preparation of administrators produced the presidential giants of the nineteenth century, the presidential entrepreneurs of the twentieth century, and will undoubtedly produce whatever is called for next. In addition, it has produced thousands of presidents, deans, and department heads who, although perhaps little known outside of their institutions or regions, have been involved with reasonably successful institutional development. Similarly, departments have persisted and have generated the most lasting of curricular developments -- sequences of disciplinary courses (and, in some institutions, have stimulated a flowering of reasonably adequate, and sometimes sublime, research). Colleges and universities have not been significantly slower to adopt proved management technology and theory than have other social institutions. Quantitatively-trained business administration graduates were a product of the late 1950's and '60's who entered business, but who also began entering even quite small educational institutions by the early 1970's. The spread of the use of computers for administration and management also has not been notably slower in collegiate institutions than in other organizations.

To the charge that the collegiate organization which evolved to provide educational service was inadequate to assimilate other responsibilities, the response must be that the charge is, for the most part, not so. Institutions have assimilated medical schools and teaching hospitals. They have accommodated separate research installations, such as the Stanford Linear Accelerator or the University of California conduct of atomic research, and they have accommodated a number of new organizations, such as centers and institutes, when needed. Some institutions were tempted to transcend their capabilities, as when a university attempted to administer a portion of a big-city school system. By and large, the impression persists that institutions have been careful either not to get into inappropriate activities or to get out quickly, once the inappropriateness became apparent. Thus, during the 1950's, a few institutions created applied research institutes, but discontinued them during the '60's, when incompatibility with university traditions became apparent. During the 1980's universities appear once again to experiment with new structures to handle bio-medical research. Whether these will last, of course, the future will indicate.

It is also relevant to guage the successes or failures of reforms attempted to correct the alleged deficiencies. Over all, the record is not particularly auspicious. The serious effort begun in the late 1950s to train future college administrators through programs in higher education produced mixed results. The number of university-based programs leading to master's and doctor's degrees in higher education administration increased from a relatively few in the mid-1950s to over 70 by 1981. These programs varied in faculty memberships from 1 to 12-15 full and part-time members. Originally, such programs were created to provide such administrative specialties as leadership for community junior colleges, student-personnel officers, and institutional research workers. Gradually, however, most of the programs assumed a somewhat more general kind of responsibility to provide generally-prepared individuals who could fit into any of a variety of administrative roles. Graduates of such programs do, indeed, enter, or remain in, such positions (a majority of doctoral candidates in these programs are part-time, already holding administrative positions). There is no good way of judging whether these formally-prepared administrators possess skills and insights not possessed by people entering administrative work through the more traditional methods. Thoughtful observers, however, are skeptical. For example, Corbally and Holmberg-Wright remark that, "No pattern that can be viewed as the ideal or model pattern for the preparation of general and academic administrative staff has yet emerged. It is clear that those who undertake to lead faculty should have faculty experience, so most general and academic administrators have completed undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional degees in fields other than management or administration and have taught or done research as faculty members. Preparation for administrative duties has, then, been on a sort of "catch as catch can" basis, along with "sink or swim" administrative science. Probably no profession -- if college and university administration can be viewed as a profession -- is filled with as many self-taught professionals. Probably no profession is filled with as many individuals who deny they really want to practice their profession. The preparation of administrators for higher education and the selection of individuals for specific administrative positions are critical elements in a staffing plan. Unfortunately, as the demands for and upon administrators in higher education increase, neither preparation programs nor selection processes seem equal to those demands" (Corbally and Holmberg-Wright, 1980, pp. 384-385). Dressel and Mayhew were even more skeptical in their view of programs in higher education. Their impression as to reality does not offer a sound base for expecting serious improvement in administration: "The Scenario of graduate study which we believe to be all too typical is for students to matriculate in programs of higher education and to attend courses on a part-time basis until entitled to sabatical leave from their institution. During their sabatical, they satisfy their residence requirements, pass preliminary or qualifying examinations, and begin the lonely quest for an appropriate thesis topic. Its discovery coincides with the end of the sabatical, and they return home to develop their projects during evenings and weekends. From time to time, they may return to the university for brief consultations with their advisors, although these meetings more frequently than not consist of reporting on progress, rather than working together to solve difficult, substantive problems. Generally, because of the number of advisees, these part-time candidates pass through the system and graduate or disappear with minimum critique or assistance from their advisors" (Dressel and Mayhew, 1974, pp. 119). The program at Stanford has frequently been judged (while somewhat unique) one of the stronger, more productive programs in higher education. It really began in the early 1950's by W.H. Cowley and was continued, primarily, by Lewis B. Mayhew. It has typically admitted between six and ten candidates a year, most of whom aspire to administrative goals, and it graduates typically four individuals a year, who do, indeed, enter such administrative goals as assistants to presidents, deans of students, and specialty workers in various educational staffs and in policy analysis positions. In general, the students who enter such programs possess reasonable academic aptitude (average 1300 on Graduate Record Examination), have bachelor's and master's degrees in a social science or education, and have had a few years' experience in such activities as residence hall advising, admissions, or student activities. However, in their professional roles, graduates of the Stanford program from either the earlier Cowley period or the later Mayhew period do not appear to be better or worse than comparable administrators having reached their positions through the more informal, traditional realm. Some became presidents, although not presidents of prestige colleges or universities. A few became professors of higher education. However, the bulk entered and remained in staff second or third-echelon administrative posts, and especially in the growing number of supra institutional agencies. Although the program at Stanford was modeled in part after programs to prepare business administrators, graduates have typically not reflected a unique and coherent new approach to administration. Thus, one cannot be really sanguine, based on recent experience, that formal preparation for collegiate administration represents a major way of rectifying administrative deficiencies. Further, although programs appear to be growing in number and size, they still do not produce in aggregate sufficient numbers to affect the main course of collegiate administration. For example, it could be estimated that there are perhaps seventy to eighty thousand academic administrators in collegiate institutions, with only four or five thousand of those having received formal preparation in graduate programs in higher education administration.

This may represent too pessimistic a view. First, some programs provide graduate students technical and research skills needed in such growing activities as sophisticated budget modeling and planning, understanding of the political complexities which intrude on higher education, sophisticated institutional research and long-range planning and newer theories and techniques of institutional development. Graduates of the Stanford program are very much in demand for such activities. Further, it may be that 1981 is still too soon to gauge the long-range significance of these programs. Up until the early 1950's business schools were really not viewed as the preeminent source for corporate executives at the highest level. They tended to be schools of commerce which taught such things as accounting and marketing, but had not developed a general theory for the preparation of high level administrators. The expansion into the present exalted position which graduate schools of business possess as suppliers of chief executives for the future was seen in just the 30 year period from about 1952 to the early 1980's. It may well be that programs such as the one at Stanford which does stress quantitative approaches to management and internship experience in high level university offices may, in the several decades ahead, achieve stature comparable to that of graduate schools of business.

There have been a number of relatively brief workshops and in-service training programs for academic administrators, such as workshops offered by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges or the Summer Program at Harvard for newly-appointed chief executive officers. People who have attended such activities testify that the experience was valuable and contributed to enriched perception of the collegiate scene. Yet, it is difficult to find visible administrative differences in institutions as a result of administrator participation in those brief programs. One particularly interesting program for the preparation of administrators was that developed by the Ellis Phillips Foundation and continued for a few years by the American Council on Education. This originally invited nominations of junior faculty members for year-long administrative internships, taken on some other campus. The purpose was to identify potential administrators and provide them experiences which could let them decide whether or not they wished to enter administration, and which might help them fulfill administrative roles more effectively. The program did succeed, and, over time, testimony of products of the program suggests that it was valuable. Again, it did not seem to change administrative functioning in the way desired by the critics of the formal preparation of collegiate administrators.

In response to the continuous criticism of academic departments, there have been numerous efforts to find a substitute, with the creation of academic divisions and the creation of centers and institutes the most prevalent. For the most part, except in relatively small institutions, in which a division of perhaps ten to fifteen faculty members makes more administrative sense than departments consisting of one or two faculty members, divisions have not emerged as strong shapers of academic policy. Since centers and institutes have, for the most part, proven to be transitory and supported by external funding, especially those attempting inter-disciplinary work, when external funding disappears, the center or institute dwindled and finally disappeared, except in those few areas, such as computing, which evolved into a traditional department. The fact that departments and departmentalism have persisted in spite of the steady tatoo of criticism suggests that departments represent valid ways of organizing collegiate institutions, and perhaps, should be strengthened, rather than continuously challenged.

The adoption of new and more sophisticated management information systems, the experimentation with new managerial roles, and the embracing of management and organization theory may eventually succeed better than improved preparation of administrators and devising substitutes for the department. Baldridge and his associates, after examining forty-two institutions which had received Exxon Education Foundation grants to develop management information systems seemed to detect such systems led to somewhat improved administrative systems and processes, such as examining more alternatives than previously had been done. Wormley found in a few privately-supported liberal arts colleges which had appointed younger chief financial officers who had been prepared in graduate schools of business that such appointments were associated with improved financial stability of the institutions. The experience of Stanford University, using increasingly sophisticated simulation models, was also associated with a steadily improving financial condition, as the institution evolved from a serious deficit-spending situation to one of budgetary equilibrium. However, in many smaller institutions, the adoption of a computer-based management information system seemed to be more cosmetic than substantive, and in the larger institutions to have generated information demanded by complex, super-institutional systems but little-used or attended to by the operating academic units within the campus itself.

With respect to organization theory, collegiate institutions appear to be quite eclectic, adopting at different times a bureaucratic model, an incremental model, a political model, a rational model, or the garbage can model suggested by Cohen and March. Further, relatively few administrators or managers using, at different times, these various models appear to be consciously aware that they are actually using theoretical models. It probably is good that more studies of how collegiate organizations behave are carried on. However, as of 1981, it is difficult to see that practice has indeed been modified, and it even could be argued that practice should not be modified. Again, March seems to have captured reality as he remarks, "Theoretical rhetoric of change seems antithetical to routine, but I have argued that effective systems of routine behavior are the primary bases of organizational adaptation to an environment. ...the theoretical emphasis on problem solving of a classical sort, in which alternatives are assessed in terms of their consequences for prior goals that are stable, precise, and exogenous. I have argued that many situations in administration involve goals that are (and ought to be) ambiguous... I have argued that when an organizational system is working well, variations in outcomes will be due largely to variables unrelated to variations and attributes of top leaders. Where top leadership affects variation in outcomes, the system is probably not functioning well. The theoretical emphasis on administrative action as instrumental, has been justified by the way it produces substantive consequences for important outcomes. I have argued that much of administration is symbolic, a way of interpreting organizational life in a way that allows individuals in organizations to fit their experience to their visions of human existence. Administrative processes are secret rituals at least as much as they are instrumental acts" (March, 1981, p. 27).

Over time, a number of new administrative positions have been recommended as ways to improve administration and organization and academic quality. These would include discrete offices of institutional research, offices of institutional planning, teams of undergraduate studies, directors of faculty development, and offices of evaluation services. While each of these new offices has, in some situations, seemed to achieve its goals reasonably well, none of the goals have been widely adopted or have long persevered. Perhaps 20% of collegiate institutions have created central offices of institutional research, and only a handful have created formal offices of evaluation services, faculty development, or centers for the improvement of instruction, and those institutions which have done so, have, for the most part, been relatively weak, little-known institutions, and even in those institutions, evidence as to significant impact is difficult to find. Gaff, commenting on development offices in several hundred institutions, points out, "Presently little evidence about the effectiveness of campus programs is available, and what evidence exists tends to be either anecdotal or limited to elementary, descriptive information about the numbers and types of faculty mambers who participated in various activities" (Gaff, 1975, pp. 181).

There have been a number of administrative and organizational changes which became reasonably wide-spread and which have presumably made qualitative improvement. Most institutions use some variation of a broadly-constituted search committee to identify appropriate administrators. Budgeting and financial reporting forms have been standardized, which facilitates comparative examination of institutional financial conditions. Paralelling the increased educational levels of faculty members, administrative officers also seem to reflect higher educational achievement in the form of advanced degrees held. Techniques for obtaining student evaluation of teaching have been improved and widely used in reaching administrative decisions regarding pay, promotion, and tenure. Many institutions have developed reasonably complete administrative and faculty handbooks modifying organizational processes and procedures.

Before proceeding with advancing some ideas as to how administration, organization, and governance might be modified positively to affect academic quality, a brief resume of frequently encountered failure is appropriate. The first is the too frequently encountered inability of corporate faculties, academic counsels, or academic senates to reach realistic agreement on institutional graduation requirements. Agreement on the part of a total faculty as to the desirability for college graduates to be comfortable in at least one language other than their native language could, very likely, be obtained in the abstract. It could also be demonstrated that thorough language facility would probably require three or four years of sustained language instruction. However, the realities of conflicting program demands, departmental or disciplinary interests, and, in many situations, fear regarding student enrollment make the adoption of the necessary requirement unobtainable. About the only agreement typically possible is for a symbolic requirement of perhaps one year of instruction or demonstration, through tests, of the minimal competency one year of instruction could reasonably produce. The same problem exists with respect to other sorts of requirements, the need for which can be demonstrated, but the likelihood of enactment remaining remote because of the inability of governance structures to generate the needed faculty consensus. A second frequently cited malfunction is with respect to faculty and administrative appointment. Far too many uninteresting people are appointed to the professoriat, far too many marginally prepared are appointed, especially among the growing core of part-time faculty, far too many people were casually advanced to tenure during the 1960's seller's market for professorial services, and, especially in lesser quality institutions, such as invisible liberal arts colleges and public community junior colleges, far too many appointments were made by a single individual, such as the academic dean, using essentially his or her intuition or idiosyncratic criteria as the template through which candidates were screened.

Obviously, administrative failure to monitor central processes, such as admissions and expenditure of funds, can have immediate qualitative implications, a situation which, all too commonly, is encountered in financially weaker institutions. Similarly, many institutions allowed many new programs to develop during the period of expansion which either institutions could not afford over time or for which the institution lacked the requisite intellectual resources. Many errors or failures which could affect quality are idiosyncratic to a particular president, dean, or department head. Thus one dean participates actively on so many committees there is no time to devote to essential administrative tasks. Another dean, preoccupies himself with detailed collection of data and publishing pedestrian, routine reports. Another new provost announces out of the blue a major administrative policy of requiring completed staffwork on the part of all administrative subordinates. Another academic vice-president over time restricted himself to his office and consultation primarily with his five division-heads, to such an extent that he lost any feel for the dynamics of the institution. His successor championed every faculty cause to such an extent that he polarized the institution between central administration and faculty and found himself alienated from central administration. There obviously can never be a guarantee against such idiosyncratic error. However, there may be structural arrangements and organizational principles, which, when applied, could minimize the likelihood of such mistakes, or, at least, minimize the damage.

The conditions essential for academic and intellectual quality which organization and administration can properly influence may be quickly summarized. The first involves the recruitment and development of faculty which is so essential. Equally important is to create an environment in which the actual creative talents of faculty can be optimally utilized. As the context for utilizing those creative talents, the organization should be such as to nourish and enhance a pervasive ethos of high regard for quality of a sort relevant to the nature of the professoriat. This seems to be highly important, for what a particular community really values and talks about is what the community very likely will obtain. The organization also should be such as to facilitate the essential processes of intellectual quality, of sustained discourse between students, and between students and faculty, and between faculty and faculty. Further, organization should be such as seriously to understand and consider needs of students, but without those needs becoming dictatorial. The organization should also limit the destructiveness of mistakes. Higher education is a conservative undertaking, and so is its major value of quality. What some regard as faculty waywardness in not embracing innovations furiously is here regarded as of high value. While faculties can be frustrating to administrators seeking change, and especially frustrating to the more extreme educational reformers, the very conservatism which produced the frustration probably has resulted in maintaining academic quality.

Rather than searching for new organizational forms and administrative structures, individual campuses would be better served to maintain most of their traditional elements, seeking only to improve them through especially clarification of responsibility. In Chapter VII, the essentiality of a strong chief executive officer was stressed. Ultimately, that individual, subject to board support and ratification, should have the final decision with respect to every single matter concerning the institution. This would include budgets, faculty appointments, admission of students and all the rest.

However, that responsibility can best be exercised in a decentralized system of organization and governance. Within such a system, the chief executive officer and the rest of central administration would be ultimately responsible for academic planning, faculty recruitment, and development, budget preparation, land and facilities planning and use, and, when appropriate, formal development activities. The exercise of that responsibility ultimately can still allow subordinate units, whether they be schools, divisions, or departments, a great deal of latitude regarding essential education matters. What is intended here may be illustrated by a description of the organizational and administrative arrangements at Stanford University. This example is used because of the highly relevant fact that that institution (more so, perhaps, than any other in the United States) accomplished a qualitative revolution in a short twenty-five years--a revolution made possible by the institution's structure: "The central administration at Stanford, although complex, is informal structure comparable to central administrations at similar institutions. However, the actual functioning of the administrative structure reveals at least two unique features. First, the office of the president is strong and influential, with final authority over all actions of the faculty, student organizations, and subordinate administrative units. The office is so organized that the president regularly expresses his or her opinions on matters discussed throughout the university. By tradition, however, and because of the very constituent groups are organized, the president arrives at decisions through wide and varied consultation. Indeed, there has evolved a consultative style of administration that values and uses the views of all constituents. A second unique feature is the office of the vice-president and provost, who is the chief academic officer of the institution but who also, as a "first among equals," orchestrates the activities of the other vice-presidents.

This, arrangement, assumes and virtually mandates a strong team effort on the part of the president and provost, and the provost's activities are perceived as having essentially the import of the president's own.

"Important to the consultative style of administration are the relationships between the central administration and other components and constituencies of the university. The institution maintains a unitary system of administration, with the president responsible soley to the board of trustees. In practice, however, at the invitation of the president, other administrative officers routinely attend meetings of the board of trustees and participate in discussions, not only of their own concerns, but of broad policy as well. The senate includes ex officio as non-voting members the president, provost, vice-provost, and dean of graduate studies and research, vice-provost and dean of undergraduate studies, and the deans of the seven schools. These administrative officers regularly attend meetings of the senate, periodically reporting on their stewardship and plans and seeking advice from the senate. President and provost also meet regularly with the deans of the several schools to discuss all impending problems, issues, and recommendations. And the provost meets periodically with faculties of the several schools to inform them of evolving policies and decisions and to seek advice. Thus, long before any decisions must be made that will affect them, the deans of the schools and their faculties have been informed as to what is likely to happen. The president and the president's chief associates meet regularly in both formal and informal sessions with students where wide-ranging and searching discussion are the rule.

"While central administration is strong, the various schools, departments, and special units enjoy considerable autonomy. In general, each school is each school is allowed to organize and conduct its programs as the dean and faculty see fit, and the schools do present different administrative programs. The schools are administered by deans recommended to the president by the provost after an elaborate search and are appointed by action of the board of trustees. Some schools have strong, well-established departments, headed by senior professors who generally hold administrative office for reasonably long periods of time. Others are organized much more flexibly, with committees for areas that deal with specialized curricular or admissions matters. The graduate and professional schools set their own admissions policies and, in fact, actually select their students, although the graduate admissions office makes the formal acceptances. With the exception of university-wide graduation requirements for undergraduates, the schools are also responsible for their own curricula, with no approval needed from the central administration. The schools determine their own by-laws and, within broad guidelines, determine appropriate work-loads for faculties. This can, and does, produce different course-loads in different schools. Schools and departments are encouraged to act responsibly through a budgetary principle that once budgets have been appropriated, the funds are the sole responsibility of the subordinate units, and they may keep in reserve funds not expended each year." ("Reaffirmation of Accreditation, March 1981," pp. 20-21).

In a centralized-decentralized system, regardless of size of institution, subordinate academic units should be delegated complete responsibility for a curriculum, with the exception of any institutionally mandated graduation requirements applicable for all students. Thus, what courses are offered at what times, and by what faculty members, should be decided within separate schools, divisions, or departments. There would then be no institution-wide curriculum committee reviewing what courses were offered. Secondly, although one can anticipate cries of horror from many chief financial officers, subordinate units should have complete control over funds once budgeted. It will be argued that many institutions retain authority separately to recall all unexpended funds at the end of each year-- funds which then can be used to balance the total institutional budget. Rather than support that system, institutions would be better served ultimately to be more parsimonious in budgetary appropriations, retaining before appropriations are made needed discretionary funds. Once funds have been granted, the subordinate units should be able to plan using them over a longer period of time than the budgetary year. This entire concept is based on good faith that men and women of good will, will act responsibly when expected to act responsibly. This notion assumes that the frequently encountered frenzied spending at the end of fiscal year in institutions which recall unexpended funds would not take place if subordinate units knew that whatever they saved could be used in the future.

An element essential to the successful functioning of assigning such important responsibilities to subordinate academic units is that their administrative leadership be expected to do a variety of things, and be given the requisite resources to do them effectively and responsibly. Too frequently, deans, directors, and department heads have either not understood their administrative roles, or were not provided essential resources. In general, the head of any academic unit significant enough to receive a definite budget should be responsible for a variety of responsibilities. These would include preparation and defense of budgets and administering them once appropriated; advocating the interests of the unit to central administration other constituencies; coordinating and orchestrating the efforts of members of the unit; evaluating faculty effort and facilitating professional development; making needed administrative arrangements; executing policies established by the unit; adjudicating differences between members of the unit, including students; serving as the titular head of the unit; and, in some institutions, seeking needed external funds to accomplish the unit's purposes. As a general rule, such a concept assumes relatively long tenure of unit heads and unit heads being (in the case of departments) relatively senior professors, rather than, as sometimes occurs, designating junior faculty members as department heads, just to handle administrative detail. It also assumes that, in one way or another, the administrative heads need to be instructed as to what are their responsibilities.

An important consequence of this doctrine is greater reliance on line officers, rather than staff officers for responsibility for a variety of services. If deans, directors, and realistic department heads are responsible for the professional development of faculty, an institution-wide office for faculty development is probably not needed.

The matter of institution-wide corporate faculties, academic councils, or senates must be considered. Although there had been a few senates in existence prior to the 1960's, the rapid proliferation took place during that troublous decade, as a means by which faculties could respond to crisis and could make a variety of faculty-relevant decisions. In general, senates have not proven to be as important as their advocates predicted, but have contributed, or could contribute, to several elements of institutional life. Institution-wide senates stand as a barrier to school or departmental parochialism by deciding upon institution-wide graduation requirements. Senates have served as an effective forum for discussion of broad institutional matters. Senates and their committees have examined and established policy on such complex matters as the general condition of the professoriat, over-all institutional policies, athletic policies, and the like. Senates can address such perennial problems as excessive length of doctoral programs, and can establish policies, however the actual implementation of those policies must take place in the budget-receiving administrative units. Senates might also be expected to advise central administration regarding financial matters, but should not possess any formal review or approving responsibility; that responsibility properly resides in the administrative domain.

The relationships between the various elements of institutional organization and administration can be illustrated by the various essential processes which every institution must use. The first and by far the most important of these processes is faculty recruitment, promotion, and decisions about tenure. In general, decisions about faculty members should be based on multiple kinds of evidence, viewed by multiple sets of eyes, in the light of multiple criteria, such as program needs, budgetary considerations, colleagueship, and over-all institutional levels of quality. To illustrate the recruitment and appointment of faculty members in a moderate sized university, consisting of four schools, each of which is organized into departments of reasonable size (ten to thirty members). Faculty recruitment would begin with a departmental or school request to central administration for a particular kind of faculty appointment. Central administration would decide whether or not to authorize the decision on the basis of fiscal conditions, the urgency of the intellectual argument advanced for the position, and the contribution the position might make to over-all institutional development. Once the position has been authorized, the unit to which it was assigned would appoint a search committee of, perhaps, three members, who would publicize the position, collect applications, and, finally, recommend one or several appropriate candidates. The dean or department head, in consultation with the full unit faculty, would make the decision to recommend or not recommend the appointment. The recommendation would then be forwarded to the next higher administrative unit -- the dean of the school, in the case of the departmental recommendation, or the vice-president for academic affairs for a school recommendation. In either event, the recommendation would eventually end up in the office of the vice-president for academic affairs, who would carefully review it, having full authority to accept it, reject it, or ask for additional information. Once that office approved the recommendation, it would be sent to an elected faculty committee, consisting of full professors, who would review the recommendation and compare it with sorts of recommendations being made by all units in the institution. Once that committee had decided to accept the recommendation, it would be forwarded to the president, who would have full authority to accept, reject, or delay. In the case of acceptance, the recommendation's essential information as to educational and professional background, teaching ability, general reputation in the field, and other appropriate information would be accumulated. This information would be reviewed by the unit faculty, in the light of quality and program needs; by the academic vice-president, in the light of institutional financial conditions and total institutional professional needs; by the elected faculty, in the light of total institutional faculty quality; and, finally, by the president, from the vantage point of oversight of the total institution.

In general, this same complicated procedure should be used regarding promotion, retention, and tenure. What the procedure does is guard against precipitous decisions by a single administrator, parochialism within a school or department, and faculty quality differentials developing across the institution. Something approximating such a process should also apply to the appointment of part-time faculty. There are, of course, cost and logistical considerations which would mitigate against using the full process to appoint someone to teach a single course. However, for even such individuals, a several-stage review process can be urged. Thus, a director of an off-campus program would be required to consult with other off-campus faculty members before recommending a part-time appointment. That recommendation would then be reviewed in at least several stages on the home campus, before the appointment was actually made.

Curricular development, excepting institution-wide graduation requirements, would follow a somewhat different process. The over-all educational mission of a school or department would be decided through consultation between the faculty, its administrative leadership, and central administration. Central administrative decisions, with respect to the curriculum, would be made through budgetary decisions and a role in faculty appointments. Thereafter, what courses were to be offered would be the exclusive responsibility of the school or department, on the ground that their faculties would know best what should and could be offered.

Similar decentralized responsibility for developing long-range academic planning and budget preparation should be lodged in the subordinate budgetary units. However, those activities subsequently are reviewed and consolidated for the entire institution. It can be argued that the discussions within those units of faculty need, curricular development, budget preparation, and long-range planning are the most potent devices to develop a sense of community that effective concern for quality is most likely to be expressed.

It should be cautioned that there are potential dangers in decentralizing such important matters. Departments may act friviously with respect to funds, they may abdicate as a unit curricular responsibility leaving decisions substantially up to individual faculty members. They may admit too many or too few students and they may really divorce themselves from any institution-wide concern. Protection against such dangers can be provided by insuring that department heads and other subordinate administrative heads fully understand their responsibilities and how those relate to other activities within the institution.

Another matter is whether or not such a centralized, decentralized system can be adopted in public institutions which are subordinate to state-wide boards, committees or agencies. It must be granted that is some states certain prerogatives are denied institutions such as maintaining budget surpluses at the end of a fiscal year. In some states all unexpended funds revert to state control and are restored as part of the succeeding budget. In some states certain kinds of curricular requirements are imposed which, of course, limits the authority which can be granted in departments. However, as a general rule there appears nothing in the nature of public institutions which precludes considerable decentralization within the constraints of state legislative or executive limitations.

Other matters relevant to the issue of quality may be quickly summarized. Undergraduate admissions policy should probably be recommended by senates, adopted by central administration and boards of trustees, and actually put into effect by a director of admissions, directly responsible to the president of the institution or to the vice-president for academic affairs. Over all grading policy should be established probably by senates with approval of the president, but actually put into effect, within policy guidelines, by individual faculty members subject also to school or departmental criteria. Similarly, policies as to what activities should and should not be associated with academic credit should be decided institution-wide, although with some latitude allowed schools and departments in interpreting those policies.

Critics of the point of view expressed here are likely to argue that virtually all suggestions will solidify traditional practices, relying on the informal system of converting academics into administrators, and this suggests that conservative faculty views will likely be held by deans, vice-presidents, and presidents. It will be argued that different points of view should be present. It will also be argued that reinforcing departments perpetuates departmental preoccupation with a discipline and with traditional values, and that only in breaking the control of departments can institutions become genuinely healthy. The response to such anticipated criticism is simply to plead guilty to the fact and to praise the outcome. Improvement of teaching, research, and service is essentially improvement within disciplines, hence strengthening organizations concerned with those disciplines, is really the only valid way of stimulating improvement. Innovations, if they are to take hold, will likely be those innovations which grow out of disciplinary discussions of teaching, curriculum, budgeting, and planning.

Chapter IX

Accreditation and the Quest for Quality

American academics reflect a paradoxical view with respect to maintaining quality. While there are academics holding vastly different beliefs regarding political, social, and economic issues from those held by other academics, over all, academic political, social, and economic beliefs tend to be more liberal than the beliefs of the total adult population. These academics have little difficulty accepting the need for governmental monitoring of such matters as food and drug preparation and distribution, maintaining airline safety, insuring that banks adhere to sound financial practices, or insuring the safety of automobiles. Nor do they likely find repugnant state government responsibility for hospital conditions, regulation of savings institutions, or licensing physicians and nurses to practice. Yet, they do find repugnant the idea that government, especially state government, should monitor in any way the substantive functioning of collegiate institutions. They generally support the idea that higher education should be self-monitoring, especially through the instrumentality of voluntary accreditation. Why bankers or stockbrokers should be implicitly judged to be less willing and able to make ethical decisions regarding their affairs than college professors and presidents is difficult to fathom. Since such a belief is widely held within the academic community, some assessment as to how industry-wide self-monitoring has, indeed, functioned is appropriate.

The academic community frequently uses hyperbole to describe the glories of self-monitoring. For example, Tucker and Mautz remark, "voluntary accreditation is one of the triumphs of higher education in the United States.

For decades, the accreditation process was a vehicle that helped pull higher education onto ascending plateaus of quality" (Tucker and Mautz, 1978, p. 314). It is generally pointed out that the United States system of self-monitoring is unique among the developed nations, most of which monitor and control collegiate education through governmental agencies.

Regional voluntary accreditation evolved slowly from the latter part of the nineteenth century. For a variety of reasons, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges was founded in 1885 to advance the cause of liberal education by promoting interests common to both colleges and preparatory schools. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools was founded in 1887 to strengthen relationships among institutions and to procure favorable educational legislation. By 1921, it had assumed the purpose of publishing a list of approved institutions. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools was created in 1885 and during its early years was concerned primarily with standardizing and inspecting high schoools. This same preoccupation with monitoring secondary schools characterized the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, created in 1895. The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges was established in 1917 with a goal to foster growth and cooperation between secondary and higher education schools of the region. The youngest of the regional associations was the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, whose antecedent was the Western Colleges Association, established in 1924 for the purpose of discussion of common problems. It was not until 1948 that that association assumed some monitoring responsibility for collegiate institutions in California. Gradually, from the turn of the century to the end of World War II, these accrediting agencies took on more and more responsibilities, including quality review of secondary schools, quality review of colleges and universities, publishing lists of accredited institutions, and providing some accreditation-related services for member institutions. This expansion of responsibility and activities is well illustrated by the pre-World War II history of the North-Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Its first constitution proclaimed the objective of establishing closer relations between colleges and secondary schools of the north-central states. During the early years, the annual meetings featured discussions of various controversial topics and preparation of related resolutions. The Association, during the nineteenth century, was mainly preoccupied with the preparation of high school students for higher education. This preoccupation persisted during the early years of the twentieth century as evidenced by the creation of the Commission on Accredited Schools and its subcommittees on unit courses of study, high school inspection, and college credit for high school work. That commission was especially influential in establishing throughout the region a Carnegie Unit and the requirement that the minimum graduation requirement of secondary schools and entrance requirements of colleges would be expressed in such units. By 1913, the Association had extended its purview to colleges and published its first list of accredited colleges. From 1913 onward, ". . . the North-Central Association was a power in education, exerting its influence directly upon schools and colleges within its own territory, but, indirectly affecting educational thought and practice throughout the country. It now began adapting administrative policies and setting academic standards that were enforceable. To be sure, its regulations still commonly affected no institution outside its own membership circle, but Association membership now became such a prized honor that few schools or colleges eligible to recognition were willing, in any way, to endanger their chances of being so affiliated, hence all of them listened with deep concern whenever the Association spoke. Indeed, to be omitted from that organization's roster was soon regarded as one of the most serious misfortunes that could befall such an institution" (Geiger, 1970, pp. xii-xiii). The next step was to create separate commissions on secondary schools and on collegiate institutions which promptly set about developing standards of acceptable institutional performance. Finally, just after the outbreak of World War II, the Association organized itself into three major commissions; one for secondary schools, one for collegiate institutions, and one designed to provide research and service.

After World War II, voluntary regional accreditation evolved and expanded in response to the profound changes which were taking place in higher education. As veteran enrollments flooded campuses, accreditation sought to ensure no serious dilution in quality, as institutions coped with large numbers of students, with small numbers of qualified faculty members. As junior colleges evolved as a unique sort of institution (neither college or secondary school), accreditation sought unique ways of dealing with them. As the demand for college teachers increased and institutions created new graduate programs to prepare them, accreditation sought to insure at least minimal quality. As such activities as the Federal presence in higher education increased, accreditation sought to provide judgments about institutions which could be accepted by Federal agencies, thus preventing direct Federal accreditation. As big-time athletics emerged with its intense competition, accreditation sought to insure that academic matters were maintained as of equal importance to athletic ability. During the late 1950s and the 1960s, as the number of new institutions increased, accreditation set up procedures to help those new institutions come into being and to insure that new institutions met at least minimal qualitative standards.

As a framework within which the performance of accreditation during the 1950s and 1960s can be judged, a number of issues facing higher education can be exposed and the degree to which accreditation has actually helped resolve those issues examined. During the period of expansion, higher education faced several critical issues. There was a claimed need to make higher education intrinsically more significant, especially with respect to such important matters as values, beliefs, and standards of personal conduct. Second, higher education had to discover effective ways of self-renewal to be able to cope with such phenomena as the amount of knowledge doubling every decade. Third was the issue of deciding who should go to college. A fourth related issue was the matter of excellence in education--what it was and how it might be achieved. The last of these transcendant issues was how to remove the barriers to higher education, such as race, religion, geography, and finances, and maintain excellence in education. Organized accreditation also faced significant operational issues, the first of which was whether accreditation should restrict itself to minimum standard setting or should seek a more expansive role. Deriving from that quandry was the issue of finding appropriate instruments, techniques, approaches, and theories if new roles and issues were to be assumed by accrediting agencies. The older techniques of formal self-studies, based upon quantification of evidence, the brief inspection visit, and the review by a board and by a total association membership could identify gross weaknesses, but seemed neither sufficiently refined nor even appropriate to aid strong institutions to become stronger. A third issue involved finding and delineating appropriate areas of responsibility for regional accrediting agencies, professional accrediting agencies, coordinating agencies and governmental agencies. Regardless of whether accreditation assumed a parsimonious function or an expansionist function, it faced the issue of identifying and training people who could do the actual work of accrediting and related activities. Last, and quite centrally, was the issue of power over higher education and who should wield it. Should power reside essentially in individual institutions, in accrediting agencies, in state-wide coordinating or controlling boards, or in governmental bureaus and agencies?

Individual institutions also faced a number of issues, the resolution of which had impact on accreditation. These ranged from quite simple problems, such as the cost of maintaining accredited status to the conflicting demands on state institutions of the state government and regional or professional accrediting agencies. The first of these characterized the truly strong and distinguished colleges and universities, which felt completely competent to decide their own standards, even when those ran counter to the standards suggested by an outside agency. Accreditation had come to be a fatiguing and costly activity, and strong institutions seriously questioned its worth. A related issue involved the time-consuming requirement for accreditation--a self study. The issue clearly was: could self-studies done for accreditation purposes be truly probing of institutional weaknesses, or was the pressure such that the self-study report would always be a self-serving, even cosmetic, effort. The last issue is whether or not institutions can gain help from accreditation or institutional improvement. Accrediting agencies came to claim this was a legitimate activity for them, but many institutions remained unpersuaded. Starkly stated, very strong institutions had to decide whether or not accreditation could be of any possible help to them, and, particularly weak institutions wanted approval more than they wanted help.

Organized, voluntary accreditation as it emerged into the 1980s, consisted of a number of structures and made use of a limited number of techniques. Regional associations were incorporated by member institutions and organized into commissions for different levels of education, each maintaining a professional staff. The members of these commissions were typically appointed by the governing body of the total association and had responsibility for establishing policies and, ultimately, making decisions on the basis of individual institutions. These regional associations, in cooperation with the special accrediting associations in fields such as nursing or medicine, in turn created and then accepted coordination from a council on post-secondary accreditation, created to ensure greater conformity of accrediting policy, procedures, and practices. The professional staffs of these various organizations, and the academic administrators and professors who actually did accreditation work, became in time a reasonably large bureaucracy with, among other purposes, its own self-perpetuation.

The principal instruments of accreditation are the completion of an institutional self-study; a site visit by a team of academics, presumably having specialized knowledge of the type of institution visited; a formal, written report of that team; and, when desired, an institution's response to the report; a review of self-study and visiting team report by, first, the professional staff, and, then, by the relevant commission, which makes the final determination of accreditation status; and, finally, an interim report at the end of a time stipulated by the accrediting agency--a report in which the institution makes an up-to-date commentary on its statements.

In theory, an institutional self-study is intended to be the keystone of the accreditation process. By conducting a thorough examination of every important element of itself, institutions are presumed able to detect deficiencies, and to plan ways of improvement. This same self-study provides an accreditation visiting-team an overview of the institution and serves as a chart guiding on-site inquiries. Generally, self-studies completed for accreditation have been of one of three different types. The first and most common is an historical overview of recent developments in the institution's history, and gathering together a variety of data to comprise a profile of the institution's situation with respect to finances, enrollment, faculty, library holdings, curricula, and extra-curricular activities. The goal for this kind of study is an over-all status report. The second variety, probably most suited for large, highly-complex institutions, consists of a general, over-all description of an institution, accompanied by much more detailed analyses of one or several important elements with which an institution is particularly concerned. The visiting committee would be expected to validate the over-all description and to probe, in greater depth, the elements collected for such scrutiny. In 1981, for example, Stanford University opted for this restricted sort, and presented an over-all narrative together with detailed analyses of issues involved in undergraduate education, foreign-language requirements, residential education, co-terminal degree programs, and overseas campuses. A third and rarely used type is a complete self-study of all important elements of an institution, but generated originally not to satisfy accreditation, but, rather, for indigenous institutional reasons. Once the self-study was completed, and recommendations expressed, it was simply converted into a serendipitous vehicle for accreditation purposes. Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, for example, had created a unique program during the 1920s which proved to be remarkably successful. Little was changed in the program between 1930 and 1960. The appointment of a new president in 1958 appeared as an appropriate time for a thorough review of the entire institution to determine what changes were necessary, as the institution moved into a decade which promised great growth. When the self-study was completed, the institution invited the North-Central Association to re-accredit the institution on the basis of the institutionally generated self-study.

Most accreditation self-studies, especially for small and middle-sized institutions, are of the first sort. About a year or a year and a half before the expiration of an accredited status, an institution will organize a self-study with a steering committee frequently chaired by the chief academic officer. The actual work of accumulating information may either be done by the existing administrative units or it may be done by ad hoc committees, whose responsibilities parallel the principal rubrics and guidelines developed by the accreditation association. Once information is accumulated, the actual draft of the self-study may be composed by a single individual, such as the chairperson of the self-study steering committee, or in sections, composed by individuals or committees responsible for major elements. Once the document is completed (normally a few months before a scheduled site-visit), copies are sent to the accreditation agency for administrative review and distribution to each member of the visiting team. While several surveys have reported that administrative officers in institutions say the self-study effort was a worthwhile experience and the accreditation bureaucracy claims that self-studies do motivate institutions to examine potential problems, other judgments regarding self-studies are warranted. First, self-studies for accreditation, especially for weak and threatened institutions, resemble a lawyer's brief, presenting all of the favorable impressions. Such a statement will obviously enumerate weaknesses and portray glowingly steps which have been taken to rectify deficiencies. Thus, an institution will point out the unconcealable fact that the institution has experienced operating deficits for the preceding six years, but will point out that its new management control system will produce a deficit-free operation a year hence, and the elimination of deficits within a specified period of time. For the most part, the problems and deficiencies reported in a self-study have long been well known on the reporting campus, with efforts having been made to solve vexing problems. The sorts of problems typically listed are financial problems, certain obvious physical plant problems, the desirability of curricular change, and need to increase library holdings, the desirability to attract more academically capable students, or the need to create some new student service. Rarely do such studies uncover previously unsuspected major problems, and rarely does the reporting of problems seem to motivate institutions to do more than they have been doing. An alert president will know that numbers of applications for admission have been declining and would have been trying to improve the condition, whether or not the self-study had been written.

A second observation regarding the principle type of self-study is that most of them could have been written by any experienced observer of collegiate institutions after spending a short while on campus and having been supplied clerical help to dig out needed factual information. The self-study report, all too frequently, appears to be a stylized art-form presenting a mosaic of information in ways most favorable to an institution. This same stylized quality is found in recommendations made in the self-study for improvement. Virtually no institution is satisfied with its advising system, attrition rate, grading system, financial resources, library holdings, proportion of faculty holding terminal degrees, amount of money available for student financial aid, general education requirements, the academic calendar followed, emphasis placed on good teaching, the amount of alumni giving, or the effective administration departments. These matters are endemic in all of higher education, and reporting them (obviously in a favorable light) all too frequently appears as a self-study ritual, rather than as a serious effort to produce change.

A last observation concerning self-studies is that they typically imply a reasonably centralized hierarchical system of decision-making through the recommendations advanced. Thus, frequently-made recommendations for changing the curriculum, improving advising, greater stress on teaching, or enriched extra-curricular activities assume that central administration will be able to do something which will produce the suggested changes. Actually, as has been stressed throughout this book, the effectual educational activities of an institution take place in the lowest academic administration units and are modified only when individuals in that unit decide to do so. While a self-study report may exert some pressure on professors, counselors, admissions officers, and registrars to change, there are generally far more potent pressures operating to restrict change until individuals for highly idiosyncratic reasons decide to modify practice.

There is a significant body of literature praising self-studies as a potent instrument for change. However, much of the literature is written by such people as directors of institutional research, staffs of accrediting agencies, perennial members of accreditation teams, or directors of planning, all of whom have a vested professional interest in proclaiming the virtues of self-studies. It is a rare ordinary faculty member, student personnel worker, or librarian who would view a self-study effort as much more than administratively generated intrusion on their time.

When the self-study report has been completed, the next stage of the accreditation process begins. This involves administrative review by the professional staff of an accreditation agency to ensure that each of the stated criteria or guidelines have received commentary, following which copies are distributed to a site-visiting committee, who are expected to review the report prior to arrival on a campus. The site-visiting committee will vary in size from as few as three for quite small institutions, to as many as twenty-five or thirty for quite large and complex institutions. Members of the site-visiting committees are selected because of their presumed competence regarding some important element in the institution to be visited, and especially because of considerable experience in making such visits. The visiting team or committee will generally spend between a day and a half to as many as three days on the campus, and the visit will follow a reasonably well-established routine. The first evening, the visiting team will likely have a dinner meeting to discuss over-all strategy. The following morning the visiting team will meet with the chief administrative officers of the institution to inform them of what information the team needs and what people team members wish to interview. Following that meeting, team members fan-out across the campus, interviewing people and trying to form impressions. The second day is similarly spent, at the end of which the team will meet to discuss preliminary findings. During the morning of the third day, team members may check on specific details and will begin writing briefs of their individual reports which are then reviewed by the team chairperson in preparation for an oral presentation at an early-afternoon exit interview with the institution's chief administrative officer. This will typically last between one and two hours, with the chairperson generalizing about institutional strengths and, in carefully-phrased rhetoric, implying the sorts of criticisms which will appear in the final written report. After departing the campus, the team will prepare a written report in typically one of two general styles. Either the team chairperson will draft the full report, and send it to team members for review, or individual members will write much of the report which will then be edited by the team chairperson before sending the draft to the association headquarters. The ritual continues with the report being sent to the institution for review and written comment to the association staff. It, in turn, distributes copies of the team report and institutional comment to members of the accreditation commission, which, at its next meeting, will review all documents, hear all statements of institutional leadership, if desired, and reach a decision regarding the accreditation status of the institution in question.

Again, some observation can be made concerning the instrument of the visiting site committee. First, visiting team members are typically second- and third-echelon administrators who have time to be away from their offices, and who enjoy visiting other institutions. Occasionally, faculty members may be included, either for token reasons, or because of presumed special relevance. In comprising a team, an accrediting association typically seeks to ensure that there are members at least somewhat competent in the major areas of likely concern and in a few areas which the self-study report had indicated were of specific concern. Thus it is almost axiomatic that there will be a financial officer, a librarian, a dean of students, a dean of academic affairs, and, possibly, a director of institutional research. Each team will typically have one or two members making their first site-visit, but with the majority having made a number of similar visits over the years. The teams will typically reflect the academic biases in American higher education; the majority will be middle-aged, white males, coming from either administration or the softer social sciences, especially professional education. There will likely be one minority group member and one or two women, and, occasionally, a professor from some of the harder disciplines, if the self-study report suggests problems in those areas. Knowing the composition of a team and the specific institution from which the team members come, the final recommendation can be predicted with reasonable fidelity. Thus, a dean of students is going to urge greater stress on counseling and advising, and a team member coming from a cluster-college is going to urge greater innovation. In a recent team visit to Stanford University, a librarian from a centralized library system not unexpectedly urged greater centralization of the Stanford libraries; an internationally distinguished foreign language specialist urged restoration of a foreign language requirement; and a faculty member from Princeton urged that more full professors become intimately involved in actual undergraduate teaching.

A second observation concerns the major instrument of inquiry used during a site-visit--the interview. Each team member will interview five or six, or even ten or twelve officials of the institution, and especially since the late 1960s, will interview a few students. These interviews will, for the most part, be unstructured, and, given the limitations of time, produce fragmentary impressions of many complex matters. The impressionistic information garnered through various interviews conducted over a period of fourteen or fifteen hours then becomes the basis, not only for over-all judgment of an institution, but for quite specific recommendations, regarding complicated matters of which the team members gained superficial information, as contrasted with the deep understanding of those who have worked with the issue for years. Thus, the team member hears from several faculty members that the administration is insensitive to true academic freedom. This then becomes the basis for a recommendation that the insitution review its policies and procedures for safeguarding academic freedom. Or, another team member interviews seven highly satisfied students in a five-hundred student professional school and reaches the conclusion that the school possesses high morale. This then becomes the basis for a team-endorsed compliment, that the school should be commended for maintaining such high morale.

Upon the basis of these interviews and team discussion, a report is prepared consisting, typically, of a team recommendation regarding accreditation status, some discussion of over-all institutional strengths and weaknesses, and a number of specific recommendations contributed by individual team members and included to ensure that each team member's contribution is included, regardless of how arrived at. Once again, the ritualistic quality is typically apparent. The team recommends re-accreditation for ten years, is pleased to note the improvement in library holdings, the elimination of accumulated deficit, the production of a faculty handbook, and the over-all improvement in faculty salaries since the last visit. The team notes, however, the need for continuing effort to revise general education requirements, to place greater stress on improvement of instruction, to increase the stress placed on advising, and to increase the size of endowment. These observations are then followed by the almost gratuitous suggestions made by individual team members and reflecting highly idiosyncratic biases and interests. A typical list would include recommending that more women be recruited on the faculty, that a program of Black studies should be initiated, that the admissions office adopt a marketing strategy, that competency-based education be instituted, that the institution consider going from a quarter system to a semester system, that library holdings in the music library be strengthened with eighteenth-century materials, and that a language laboratory be created.

The final act in this process is the review of the team report by the accrediting commission, and judgment made concerning accredited status. As was true for visiting teams, accrediting teams are comprised largely of middle-aged, white males from administration and the social sciences, especially professional education. They may have token women, and, since the late 1970s, a non-professional layperson, supposedly representing the public interest. Many commission members will have had many years experience doing accreditation work, and who come from a relatively small accreditation oligarchy in the region served. In 1981, for example, the commission of the Western College Association consisted of seventeen members, four of whom were women (two laywomen); six oligarchs, with long service in accreditation; and three minority-group members, two of whom were not minority-group members in their own state of Hawaii. One member was a junior college administrator, and one member a high school teacher.

This commission will typically meet twice a year for two to two and a half days and will consider an agenda of typically a hundred or more items, of which thirty or forty will be action items regarding the accredited status of individual institutions. Since each self-study will average a hundred and twenty or more pages, and each visiting-team report will average thirty-five to fifty pages, it would be impossible (although desirable for truly responsible decisions) for all commission members to read all relevant documents. A typical procedure is for one or two commission members to be asked to read all documents for one or two institutions and to suggest a recommendation for commission action. In many respects, a commission decision on the accredited status of an institution is made by one or two commission members (although ratified by a majority) based on a cursory reading of a complicated self-study report and a series of recommendations of a visiting team made on the basis of impressions gained through superficial visits with a small minority of people on a particular campus. The way commissions operate means that for the vast majority of institutions considered for an accreditation decision, the detailed attention paid is even more superficial, since the over-all reputation (warranted or not) is such that the commission would not dream of a drastic action. Commissions will typically spend five or six minutes discussing the major institution in the region, with there being no real question but what a recommendation favorable to the institution will be forthcoming. Thus, the commission may spend five minutes concerning a 27,000-student campus and two hours considering a 500-student, non-traditional institution.

The salient question here, of course, is how well or poorly has voluntary regional accreditation served its purposes, especially the purpose of ensuring and stimulating educational progress, and the only answer is that no one really knows. Since the end of World War II, virtually no publicly supported accredited institution has lost its accreditation, nor have newly-created ones been denied accredited status. In the private sector, no institution established for ten years or more and having a reasonably secure financial base has lost its accreditation, or when newly created failed to gain it. Occasionally, some such institutions are embarrassed a bit by being granted a shorter period of accreditation than normal, or required to prepare and submit interim reports and financial statements. Throughout the country, however, no institution of reasonable longevity, not in danger of imminent bankruptcy, located on a definite campus, and offering reasonably recognizable programs is in any danger ever of losing accredited status. One can make a reasonable estimate that out of over 3,000 collegiate institutions in the country, there could be doubt regarding the outcome of the accreditation process for not more than 10 percent, and those 300 institutions would probably enroll, at the very outside, 300,000 out of the 11,500,000 enrolled in higher education in 1981.

With respect to the amorphous matter of academic, intellectual, or educational quality, several broad observations can be advanced. During the period of ascendency of normal accreditation since World War II, the form and substance of undergraduate education has fluctuated wildly, seemingly in response to such forces as the launching of the Russian satelite Sputnik or the student protest movement of the late 1960s. During that same period of ascendency, there has been a steady decline in foreign language requirements and in student performance on ability and achievement tests. There has been, especially in four-year institutions, steady increases in proportion in faculty holding the doctorate--improvements directly correlated with increases in the production of doctorates by the nation's graduate schools. Especially during the 1960s there was considerable experimentation in collegiate institutions, however, that seemed more related to the available ability of external funds encouraging innovation, than to the stimulating influence of accreditation.

Supporters of voluntary accreditation will argue that, while accreditation very likely should not be expected to affect national qualitative trends, it has contributed to the improvement of quality within campuses, either because of the self-study process revealing qualitative deficiencies, the insights of accreditation team members discovering need for improvement, or to the influence of the accreditation association, lending its strength to improvement efforts already underway. However, such claims are difficult to document, and are implausible, except in a few extreme situations. Self-studies are reasonably rational reviews of institutional history and status, and are not psychological techniques designed to uncover hidden problems. Those who conduct self-studies are, for the most part, well aware of conditions which should be changed and simply await propitious times, or for the condition to become acute. An institution running deficits, experiencing enrollment declines, having a high attrition rate, or permitting a qualitative decline in library holdings, holds no surprises for its leadership. As to the visiting team uncovering error, this is also implausible, in part because of the brevity of site-visits and the reliance on institutional sources for understanding, and the same skepticism obtains with respect to accreditation association prestige, except in the cases of extraordinarily weak and little-known institutions.

Accreditation, presumably, also influences quality by denying accredited status to institutions until they achieve at least minimal qualitative levels. However, the track record of this happening is decidedly mediocre. Orlans has noted that there are relatively few institutions which has been denied some accredited status if their financial base appear reasonably secure, and examples abound in each of the six regions of the unwillingness and inability of accreditation to force quite questionable institutions to cease their activities. It took the North-Central Association ten years to finally act conclusively with respect to Parsons College in Iowa, and, when it did, the action was apparently taken on the basis of personal irritation on the part of the commission members reviewing the institution's status. In both California and Florida, accreditation has devoted ten years or more to institutions offering Ph.D.s on the basis of as few as seven weeks of formal instruction, yet has been unable to deny such institutions some accredited status. The Western College Association has devoted well over a dozen years to control an institution offering a variety of under-financed off-campus programs around the world, only to find that in 1981 the institution continued its questionable ways of colonization but without adequate resources. The North-Central Association also struggled for approximately the same length of time to control another colonizing institution which had been forced, through financial exigencies, gradually to eliminate about half of the centers and programs it maintained throughout the nation. In 1981 a visiting team, by a one-vote majority, failed to discredit, although the report did point out glaring deficiencies. The somewhat critical report was significantly softened by the review mechanism, in effect allowing the institution to continue its questionable efforts.

Voluntary regional accreditation faces a variety of issues, the adequate resolution of which will determine whether accreditation in its traditional form will continue or not. The first of these involves the ability of accreditation, using historic instruments, to deal with the strong, high-quality prestige institutions on the one hand, and the new, financially weak, non-traditional programs on the other. When Stanford University came up for re-accreditation in 1981, a visiting committee, composed of ten distinguished members, made a series of comments and recommendations addressing what had long been obvious to the institution's leadership, and which had been actively under study by the institution. The team pointed out that grade inflation had affected Stanford as it had most institutions throughout the country, and that the high tenure rate denied positions to younger scholars, women, and minority-group members. The team suggested the desirability of greater involvement in undergraduate instruction on the part of distinguished senior faculty members. It urged the desirability of the perennial inter-disciplinary courses and experimentation in language instruction. The committee made the far from revolutionary suggestion that as the computer grew more and more central in American life, undergraduate students should develop computer literacy. Also, not unexpectedly given the times, the team hoped for more recruitment of women faculty members. The team also noted that Stanford, as a matter of well-thought-out policy, had developed an outstanding coordinated library system, but the team, somewhat plaintively, suggested that there were virtues to a centralized library system. The team urged more administrative structure concerned with undergraduate education, despite the fact that the institution maintained at the vice-provost level, a dean of undergraduate studies, complete with staff and budget, an office not generally found in research universities. Stanford participated in the re-accreditation process because its officers recognized that some form of institutional certification had to be accomplished and that it was better to support voluntary accreditation, rather than accreditation handled by state and federal agencies. Apart from such a symbolic value, one can wonder what good to the institution came from an expenditure of over $25,000 and the commitment of a not inconsiderable amount of administrative time.

Accreditation still, as of 1981, has been unable to cope with the hundreds of non-traditional programs which began springing-up all over the country in about 1970. As this development began, the associations, quite sensitive to complaints that they were overly rigid and tended to stifle innovation, adopted an exceedingly lenient attitude toward new programs, as, for example, one institution which developed a baccalaureate program essentially requiring one year of academic work, a master's program, requiring another year of one class a week, and, through a cooperative arrangement with another non-traditional institution, a Ph.D. program. The association granted candidate status to the institution. As public criticism grew regarding such institutions, the associations tried to tighten their requirements, and did develop criteria of quality which new programs were expected to meet. However, associations time and time again were reluctant to apply those criteria. Redd, using the criteria developed by the Western Colleges Association for doctoral programs, found that, typically, doctoral programs in educational administration offered in the non-traditional mode by accredited institutions did not conform to those criteria and were judged qualitatively deficient. Dressel (1978, 157-159), reviewing a large number of accredited, non-traditional doctoral programs, raised several unresolved issues which accrediting agencies simply have not confronted (Research Reports, vol. 2, Sept. 1978, pp. 157-159).

With respect to the vast majority of institutions which fall between those two extremes, it increasingly appears that financial stability is the primary factor upon which accredited status rests, and that the typical sanction is awarding accredited status for less than the maximum period allowed. Crockford, commenting on the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, notes, "Of the twenty independent colleges and universities re-accredited in 1980, only nine received ten-years terms; of the nine publicly-supported colleges re-accredited, six received ten-year terms. This distinction is even more apparent in the apportionment of terms among the two-year colleges, where the independents are all small and operate for the most part on annual income. Of the six independent two-year colleges (two of these now offer baccalaureate degrees but still enroll most of their students in two-year programs) re-accredited in 1980, only two received five-year terms, the longest term awarded in this category; for the five public community colleges, three received ten-year terms, one a seven-year term, and one a five. Apparently the commission assumes that state-supported colleges will not be allowed to die for lack of funds, and, therefore, their existence a decade hence is a safe bet.

"If, as some suspect, the question of long-term financial stability of a college is the major factor in determining length of the accreditation term, then, to some degree, the other standards for accreditation become a mockery. No matter how well a college achieves its purposes and objectives, it is likely to be penalized if its long-term existence seems to the commission problematical. Certainly, one who knows the college is re-accredited in 1980 has trouble believing that the three community colleges awarded ten-year terms are of higher quality in programs, instruction, and student services, than the three independent junior colleges, which received four-, three-, and two-year terms.

"Such short terms seem to the recipients a form of inadvertent harassment, brought about by the commission's timidity and lack of imagination. Certainly, they can concede, long-term stability is important, but periodic monitoring of readily-available financial data could address this concern. If an institution appeared to be in serious financial trouble, nothing would preclude the commission from taking ad interim action. On the other hand, the continued use of projected financial stability as the decisive criterion when setting periods of accreditation seems to cast the commission in the role of consumer advocate, rather than guardian of educational quality, and leads directly to questions about the need for accrediting agencies" (Crockford, 1981, p. 6).

A major issue involved in the seeming inability of accreditation to guage and act on qualitative matters appears fear--fear of potential law-suits, fear of being regarded as reactionary, fear of offending friends and colleagues, and fear that actions might destroy the institutions which once were honorable and respected, but which have fallen into difficult times. This fear is rationalized through an unwillingness to make judgments primarily on the basis of inputs--faculty preparation, library holdings, quality of students, and the like--and an inability to use output measures, such as student test performance, because of the technical problems of acquiring such data. The argument seemingly goes like this: While it is true that only part-time faculty of marginal qualifications are used, and students do not spend much time in class, and the financial basis is shakey, relying entirely on tuition, and, while great weight is given to life experience for academic credit, nonetheless, there is no way of determining that students in such programs receive any better or worse education than do students in traditional programs. In the absence of such evidence, it would be better to tolerate such programs on the ground that they might be doing good.

Another major issue contributing to the ambiguity of evaluation and judgments of accrediting associations is the relationship between accreditation and institutional eligibility to participate in the many federal support programs. The Congress has written into much of its higher education legislation that funds may go only to accredited institutions or institutions that have established a quasi-accredited status, such as recognition of academic credit by three accredited institutions. Since most of the institutions over which accreditation might have real power are absolutely dependent on federal programs for continued existence, retaining accredited status is a life and death matter. Hence, the tendency to threaten litigation if accreditation is not granted. This particular issue is extraordinarily complicated, involving among other matters, a constitutional question as to whether or not federal use of accreditation to establish eligibility is an illegal delegation of the congressional power to make law. The fundamental quality concern is the federal assumption that accreditation establishes that a given institution is providing qualitatively acceptable educational programs. As has been repeatedly implied, there can be serious question as to whether voluntary regional accreditation can determine such a matter. It has been noted that ". . . regional accreditation does not make distinction in quality . . . there are relatively few eligible institutions that are not regionally accredited. Institutional accreditation is also charged with being little relevant to the actual education a student will receive, being redundant for most degree-granting schools (i.e., most have it; it does not discriminate among institutions), and being especially unsatisfctory within the world of proprietary schools" (Trivett, 1976, p. 22).

There are a cluster of operational issues with perhaps the most significant the experience, quality, and judgment of visiting team members. The majority of visiting team members (with perhaps good reason) tend to be male administrators from middle-quality public and private institutions, with a sprinkling of faculty members, notably from education and the social sciences, and some representation of women and minority groups. They are individuals who have demonstrated knowledge and competence with respect to their administrative responsibilities, but who are expected to make generalist's evaluations and judgments about an institution, in addition to making evaluations and judgments of those parts of an institution relevant to the experience of the team members. Since a majority of most teams have made a number of accreditation visits, they probably have acquired some sophistication in examining a proto-institution. However, relatively few members have had the broad clinical experience coming from examining or consulting with three or four hundred different institutions of various sorts. While some associations pay a nominal honorarium for members' time, others do not. An important element of a view of a membership is the question of motivation. Why would an academic dean of a state college accept three and a half day visits to perhaps three or four institutions a year, in addition to spending time drafting and reviewing written reports of a visitation. There probably are many different motivations, including a desire to be of professional service, a desire for activities to break the monotony of one's main occupation, a desire to exert influence in a larger domain than one's own institution, or a desire to learn what other institutions are doing.

An approach to the qualitative issue with respect to visiting teams may be obtained by examining a stereotypic team member. He is an individual with a Ph.D. in education or one of the social sciences, or one of the verbal humanities, who, early in his career, developed a greater taste for administration and organization than for teaching, research, and scholarship. He is not quite what might be called a cosmopolitan, who identifies with many national or international groups, nor is he what might be called a local, who obtains virtually all professional satisfactions from the activities on a single campus. He is motivated to participate in accreditation because he has a sense of service, but also becuase accreditation provides him with a reference group, beyond the confines of a single campus. He is not a producing scholar, and because of administrative duties, has not kept up with intellectual developments of the field in which he was trained. He has some notions about broad national configurations of higher education, but is by no means an expert in such matters. He is, in general, an honest and conscientious professional person, who uses his own limited experiences as a basis upon which judgments will be based for institutions of many different types. The danger is that such a person will feel qualified to pass judgments within conservative limits, but may feel uncomfortable making strong qualitative judgments, either positively or negatively.

In addition to quality, there are issues of optimum size for visiting committees, many different potentialities for conflict of interest, and the technical skills of team members of using interviews and documents as bases for precise judgments. With respect to none of these have the associations been able really to resolve.

However, the transcendent unresolved issue is the proper role of voluntary regional accreditation. Spokesmen claim the safeguarding of the public interest and maintaining the comparability of academic credit is the major reason for being. Adequately to safeguard the public interest, accreditation should state that one institution barely meets minimal standards, while another institution far surpasses them. Yet accreditation has been unwilling to make such fine discriminations. Similarly, the matter should be considered, but typically is not, that the academic credit awarded by one institution probably is qualitatively different from that awarded at another institution.

The other two claimed roles are those of motivating institutions to achieve higher and higher qualitative levels and stimulate educational innovation. Yet, the instruments used to accomplish those purposes must be judged, on balance, as inadequate.

If voluntary regional accreditation is to have a viable role in affecting educational and academic quality, it probably lies in the direction of narrowly and sharply focusing on the single matter of insuring that institutions meet minimal standards to warrant accreditation as a collegiate institution, and it should express that concentration by considering a limited number of institutional characteristics, such as financial stability, academic preparation of faculty, number and relevance of library holdings, adequacy of physical space, security and accuracy of student records, and the quality of students. In short, regional accreditation might well consider a return to earlier standards with respect to the predominent characteristics of institutions. In general, accreditation should not attempt to judge the quality of general educational requirements, because there is no evidence that one form is better or worse than another. It should not attempt to gauge quality of teaching, for a similar reason. It should not seek to make qualitative judgments about advising, student services, the presence or absence of cultural events, campus morale, the presence or absence of educational innovation, or the amount and level of student financial aid. These are all important elements in collegiate education, yet a typical visiting committee lacks the sophistication to make meaningful judgments, and rather than encourage superficial and unsophisticated judgments, it appears better not to make them at all. A two-and-a-half day visit of a team whose members know an institution only through a catalogue and a self-study report has no way of judging whether one system of academic advising is any better or worse than any other one.

Paralleling this concentration on a limited number of standards should be an indication of what are and are not appropriate collegiate purposes, and what the characteristics are which seem most likely to facilitate their achievement. During the 1960s and 1970s, regional accreditation adopted the policy of trying to judge institutional achievement of whatever purposes it had set for itself, and extreme extrapolation of this doctrine demonstrates that it is nonsense, for even the most flexible accreditor would draw the line at accepting an institution avowedly preparing prostitutes. However, the doctrine has allowed institutions to award collegiate academic credit for sexually remedial education, because the institution claimed as a purpose improving the educational plight of minority-group ghetto dwellers. As has been repeatedly stressed in this book, there is a norm, especially expressed in elite institutions, as to what the fundamental purposes of a collegiate institution are, and the best way they might be achieved. Those should govern the judgments of accreditation with the clear implication that if an institution wishes to do something else, that is its business, but doing something else does not entitle it to an accredited status of a collegiate institution. It is entirely appropriate for an institution to teach Vietnamese refugees basic English, to teach women basic automobile maintainence, or even to teach income-tax evasion, but not as a collegiate institution entitled therefore to accreditation.

Consistent with this view, there probably should be a reduction in the central staff of accreditation associations, the size of accreditation commissions, and the frequency of their meetings, the size of visiting teams, the frequency of re-accreditation efforts, and the amount of interim reporting. By 1981, the normal period between accreditation visits was ten years, which is probably too frequent for reasonably financially-stable institutions. Along with that ten year period, accreditation has developed the pattern of accrediting some institutions for a shorter period and asking for interim reports showing progress in rectifying whatever deficiencies a past visit uncovered. For the most part, this procedure seems almost to be harassment of some institutions, with the submission of interim reports having virtually no effect on the actual accredited status of the institution, but which produces anxiety just because the maximum period for accreditation had not been granted. If accreditation is concerned about the financial stability of an institution, annual financial reports may be requested and scrutinized, and, if they reveal a steadily eroding situation, then conditional steps could be taken. As fewer visits are made and fewer reports required, the workload on association staff and commission automatically declines, thus requiring fewer people, fewer meetings. And, as the number of things to be examined are reduced, the cost of visiting teams can also be reduced.

This quite circumscribed role for accreditation should simplify relationships with state and federal government. In essence, accreditation would say, "Here is what a collegiate institution is, and here are its characteristics. We will certify institutions which demonstrate those characteristics, and the federal government may, if it wishes, use that certification as a basis for eligibility to participate in various federal programs. Accreditation will not modify its conception of what is a collegiate institution so that a variety of non-collegiate activities may become qualified for federal funds. If the federal government wishes to provide financial aid for area vocational schools, for remedial institutions, or for institutions offering basically short vocational courses, the Congress can enact appropriate legislation."

Chapter X

Suprainstitutional Organizations, Boards, and Agencies

Although the odds are great that the trend toward centralization of authority above individual campuses in publicly controlled higher education cannot be reversed (and possibly should not), it can be argued that coordinating boards, boards controlling a number of separate campuses, and statewide regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over individual campuses have had virtually no positive effect on academic quality, and that, very likely, the principal effects have been negative. Indeed, in view of the elaborate rationale which has been used to justify suprainstitutional mechanisms it could be said this is a case of the emperor's new clothes.

It should be stressed that the American system of higher education has established some remarkable qualitative achievements. After having met the unexpected veteran demands at the end of World War II, the system produced the high quality faculty needed for the expansion in enrollments of the 1960s, the needed doctors and other health workers to cope with rising health expectations on the part of a growing population, established a research apparatus which, for a time, placed the United States in the lead of worldwide scholarship and technology advance and, for a very short while, achieved some agreement as to what were the purposes of undergraduate education and how they might be best achieved. However, those achievements might be better thought of as the contribution of earlier, less organized conditions than the results of the era of coordination and supracampus control. It is quite likely that the research universities existing as independent institutions in 1958 did produce, through expansion, all of the Ph.Ds which were needed throughout the 1960s and 1970s, and that the surplus of unneeded Ph.D.s in the late 1970s represented the product of new graduate programs generated by the coordinating or controlling mechanisms created after 1958. It can be demonstrated that the United States began to experience a variety of qualitative declines beginning almost exactly as supracampus organizations began to be the organizational rule. While there were some supracampus boards of various sorts, even before World War II, in states such as New York, Florida, Kentucky and Oklahoma, the creation of such agencies in the overwhelming majority of the states took place during the 1960s, and this might well be somewhat related to the relative decline of the United States patent balance between 1966 and 1976 and the proportional decline of production of the world's major technological innovations from 80 percent in 1956-58 to 59 percent in 1971-73. The earlier qualitative heights of United States leadership in science came largely because of a combination of the favorable conditions of massive increases in Federal support of research from the mid 1950s to the mid 1960s and the concentration of research activity in the well established research universities. Decline in Federal support of research and in research productivity began almost simultaneously with the creation of boards designed to coordinate or control many different campuses. Now, obviously, these correlations will not support precise inference of causality, yet they do suggest some possibility of relationship.

Before exploring such matters, a restatement of explanation, definition or criteria of quality is in order. As even the naive or uninformed knows, American higher education, in one way or another, maintains the three functions of education or teaching, research or the production of knowledge, and certain kinds of service to the society. It has earlier been argued that the educational mission of colleges and universities was to prepare the young, through the use of word, number, and abstract concepts, to understand, cope with, and ultimately control the environment and, especially, to prepare people for a limited number of professions or vocations resting on a broad theoretical or conceptual base. Collegiate scholarship, research, or the production of knowledge can be similarly sharply defined. Research and scholarship, appropriate to colleges and universities, consists of three general sorts: there is the research and scholarship expected of professors as they prepare the courses they teach, and this is, theoretically, at least, an enormously time-consuming activity, illustrated by the fact that professors claim they spend perhaps 55 hours a week in professional work, of which only 6-12 hours are spent in actual classes; much of the remainder of the time is spent preparing for those classes. The second sort is the research conducted by graduate students under professorial supervision, designed both to uncover new knowledge and to learn through doing research and scholarship. The third sort (whether supported by institutions in the form of faculty salaries or outside agencies) consists of efforts to find new knowledge, either for its own sake or to contribute to solutions of complex practical problems. These three sorts permit a wide variety of activity but still not an infinite variety. The touchstone of appropriateness of research is found, first of all, in the disciplinary divisions of college, albeit the number of those divisions is expanding. Appropriate collegiate research consists of efforts to understand those divisions and to add to knowledge in them. The second touchstone is the judgment of individuals who have engaged in research and scholarship in a systematic way. This is illustrated by the peer review system by which research grants are made. In the United States, support has rested on the identification of worthwhile, creative, original, and significant research in large measure proposed by individuals. Support of research in the United States is thus based on talent and on merit of individuals.

Similarly, service is derivative of the disciplinary efforts in either or both education and research of college professors. The collegiate institution is not an all-purpose, service-rendering enterprise offering whatever kind of service individuals want and which, in some way, can be paid for. Rather, it is providing service directly related to professorial expertise in a discipline. The clearest examples of appropriate service are agricultural short courses and agricultural advice given to farmers by professors in schools of agriculture, whose courses and expertise grow out of their ongoing agricultural research. An example of valuable service which would be inappropriate in a collegiate setting would be institutions without academic programs in child growth and development operating a community child care center. In this regard, public community-junior colleges which purport to offer whatever kinds of services the surrounding community desires, but without a critical mass of scholarship and professional expertise to undergird the services offered, contribute seriously to qualitative deterioration.

The essential question for this chapter is the actual and potential relationships of supracampus agencies to quality performance of those three functions.

The surge in state creation of supracampus agencies began in approximately 1958 as state governments recognized that they would need to create many new collegiate institutions if the increasing college-aged populations, having rising educational aspirations, were to be accommodated. The most essential reason to consider new organizational structures was to keep the number of educational organizations appealing directly to the legislature for support within manageable limits. State higher education and budget committees could deal with a single state university and five or six state colleges and even a handful of state-related junior colleges. However, as states began to act on an emerging premise of public policy that there should be a higher educational institution within commuting distance of most students within a state, this could be done only be doubling or more separate campuses. The task of holding budget hearings for fifteen or more institutions began to loom as an impossible situation, hence the search for some way of combining institutions into fewer number of organizations reporting directly to the legislature. The other missions or purposes were also conditions of growth and expansion. There was need for some agency concerned with statewide educational policy to recommend or decide where new institutions should be located. Without some such course, expansion could very likely take place in politically powerful regions of the state, although the need might as well be elsewhere. There was also need for some agency to insure that expensive and unnecessary program duplication was either prevented or kept to a minimum. It was reasoned that individual campuses might well be tempted to create prestigious but expensive programs such as medicine or dentistry, regardless as to whether the state needed them or could support them. If wise planning were to take place, more reliable information would be needed, reflecting the educational situation of an entire state. The information should be compatible with other sources of information. Since, historically, each campus had created its own (frequently rudimentary) information systems, there was need for some agency to develop and use an effective information system. There was the related need that some agency undertake detailed and sustained planning to insure that state concerns were accomodated and that the expansion of higher education harmonized with other statewide programs. Thus, as states began to create, as the first step, coordinating agencies, they were assigned a typical set of responsibilities. They were to collect compatible information from institutions, to develop long-range state plans for higher education, to recommend and/or approve locations of new campuses, recommend and/or approve educational programs, and to review budget request from individuals institutions and either make recommendations concerning them or consolidate them into a single budget request for all of the institutions within the state.

Although each state created a structure or structures in the light of its own traditions and situation and some states changed structures over time as conditions changed, in general, four organization types were employed. The first was the creation of a consolidated governing board responsible for all publicly supported institutions in the state, as, for example, in Georgia, Idaho, and Montana, and eventually, Wisconsin. The second consisted of a consolidated board for all four-year public institutions and some other separate agency responsible for two-year community junior colleges, as is found in Arizona, North Carolina, or Florida. The third form consisted not of governing boards, but coordinating boards, either with authority actually to approve programs, or with only authority to review programs and to make recommendations. Of the former, Illinois, Ohio, and Maryland created coordinating boards which actually consolidated budgets, while Colorado, Texas, and Virginia created boards which could review and recommend on budgets. Of the latter (having program review and recommendation authority only), Alabama's board consolidated budgets, California's board reviewed and recommended on budgets, Nebraska's board had no statutory budget role, and in Delaware, Vermont, and Wyoming, the coordinating board was created by the governor and used primarily for advice to the Chief Executive regarding higher educational matters.

A reasonably typical pattern during the 1960s was for a state to initiate a study or studies of higher educational needs of the state. This would then be followed by the creation of some form of a coordinating board which, after developing a staff, would create the first master plan for the state's higher education development. This would be followed by demands that institutions also develop master plans, some division of the statewide plan followed by some structural or organizational changes, such as creating systems of institutions or multi-campus institutions, or changing from a coordinating board to some variant of the consolidated governing board. These various steps are so interrelated that for evaluation purposes they should be considered in aggregate. By 1970, the successes and failures of early attempts at supra-campus management revealed some reasonably well-warranted assertions. On the plus side, educational statistics and other information were considerably improved and made much more reliable. Second, the processes of long-range planning had been improved and the quality of plans in 1970 made considerably clearer and more realistic than were plans developed a decade earlier. Because of the efforts of staffs from these suprainstitutional organizations, legislators appeared to be considerably better informed and more sophisticated regarding educational problems and issues than had been true earlier. In some states, the creation of a statewide system of two-year community junior colleges was directly the result of the coordinating council efforts. Balancing these successes were a number of failures or matters concerning which there was no good persuasive evidence of success, coupled with a presumption of failure to achieve mandated purposes. The track record of states creating needed new campuses in appropriate numbers and in effective places, on balance, was not particularly good. Thus, California created two university campuses and three college campuses which either were not needed or were so located as to deter students's enrollments at planned-for levels. Wisconsin created two branches of the university which the state could not afford and which turned out to be not critically needed. Florida mislocated the placement of one university campus (Florida Atlantic in Boca Raton) and created a specialized campus in Orlando which events proved not to have been particularly needed.

Nor was the record of the 1960s of preventing unnecessary duplication of expensive programs particularly good. California, Michigan, and Alabama each ended up with one medical school too many, and Colorado with an unnecessary dental school. Virginia and Illinois ended up with a variety of new Ph.D. programs in various of the humanities which duplicated the efforts of other institutions in those states. In general, it seemed to be true that a persistent individual institution could, through perseverance, overcome the resistance of the statewide agency to whatever new program the insitution wished to put into effect. This persistence might take the form of bootlegging a new medical school into existence through gradually creating most of the courses which would be needed for a medical school and then taking the argument that a medical school could be created with virtually no increased cost to the state. Or, the persistence might be reflected in marshalling local legislative political power to overcome the efforts of the coordinating board to limit growth.

Although statewide agencies were instructed to accommodate the private sector to insure its vitality, for the most part statewide boards concerned themselves only with public institutions, regardless of the impact of locating two institutions, for example, near the private sector. A major reason for creating statewide agencies was to contain costs. Yet, by 1970, there was no evidence that a coordinated or controlled statewide system was able to do things any more economically than the somewhat less controlled states.

This was the situation as the creation of supracampus organizations reached its peak. Five years later, after continued expansion of statewide coordination and control, there was really no additional information as to how successful or unsuccessful the organizations were. Berdahl indicated that, while there had been some informal evaluations of particular state agencies, there was little more than subjective judgments which reflected the underlying biases of individuals making them (Berdahl, 1975, pp. 1-13). The general point of view of the authors Berdahl recruited for his report, all of whom had had experience with suprainstitutional agencies, was that higher education had problems and that some form of statewide organization was a possible way of solving them, although they could adduce no persuasive evidence that this was so. Indeed, the authors present a maddening set of propositions or affirmations. One argued that state boards lead to planning and that planning is especially necessary in times of debility, therefore state boards are probably essential. Another seemed to say statewide boards are good, but they haven't been evaluated properly, but perhaps if we used a modified business model, we might learn something. Still another, then a member of the Florida House of Representatives, simply argued that state boards have been around long enough and that they now must be evaluated. Other authors argued in similarly abstract ways. The intriguing matter is that none of these essays concerned with evaluating statewide boards dealt with the concept of educational quality and how boards might or might not affect it (Berdahl, 1975, pp. 1-13).

A similar sense of the inevitability of increased statewide centralization, but the lack of information as to its results, is reflected by the board of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1976, pp. 11-12). It remarked that "the centralization seemed to have had no measurable direct impact on policies or on practices. No provable case can thus far be made that higher education is in any way better because of the centralization, except where it has taken place, in the one area of advanced academic planning for higher education as a whole. It is, of course, not possible to know, however, what would have happened in the absence of the centralization that did occur. Some people feel since the need for planning will inevitably lead to statewide centralization, a consolidated statewide board of control is probably the best arrangement. The popularly labelled Second Newman Report similarly reveals disenchanted inevitability, pointing out the increased number of multi-campus institutions and the tendency for statewide boards to assume more and more prerogatives. Although Newman and his colleagues deplored such developments, they accepted the conventional rationale that "given the growth in numbers of students, the number of institutions, and the size of budgets, some system of organization and management of institutions is required. It is manifestly impossible for a legislature to supervise the operation of 20 or 50 or 100 campuses. The use of the multi-campus system concept is thus the logical outcome of growth (Newman, 1973, p. 55). That report, too, fails to address the issue of quality, in a sense almost wishing that it would go away.

In 1980, the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education again seemingly uneasy with the growth of statewide higher education boards, nonetheless argued that they might have some utility with respect to quality through the initiation of reviews of programs in the public and private institutions in the state. However, the commission presented no evidence as to whether its expectation that program review might affect quality was warranted and, essentially, used a negative argument to support its contention. "Candid evaluations of program quality, made by competent and disinterested reviewers, would be particularly valuable during a period of retrenchment. They can both provide warnings to administrators in a particular institution and help institutions as a group resist the temptation to compete for students by lowering academic standards. Further, independent judgments of program quality should be an important consideration when a state agency redefines the mission of an institution and changes its role or even recommends closing it" (Sloan Commission, 1980, pp. 16-17).

Overall, the professional critical writing about suprainstitutional organizations has a timid quality. It is as though the creation of such agencies were so inevitable that their performance should not be assailed with respect to essential matters for fear even more highly centralized agencies would be created as a result of such criticisms. Not only does there seem to be a reluctance to criticize; there is typically acceptance of some need for supracampus organizations to accomplish long-range planning (good), ways of insuring accountability (good if not carried too far), and rational allocating of scarce resources in a time of stability or even decline (good).

Actually, statewide coordinating boards, consolidated boards of trustees, and multi-campus institutions are vulnerable to a variety of criticisms, especially concerning achieving or maintaining quality with respect to the three major purposes of education, research, and service. An overly simplified example can make an important point. The University of California at Berkeley is part of a highly centralized system which, in turn, is coordinated by a long-established coordinating agency, whereas the University of Michigan operates quite independently of a rather weak coordinating agency and, for the longer portion of the growth years of 1950 to 1970, operated with no coordination at all. There is no persuasive evidence that there are any essential qualitative differences between Berkeley and the University of Michigan.

Much more than analogy is needed. In some respects it might be inappropriate to expect suprainstitutional agencies to be able to affect quality with respect to the three major purposes of higher education, which are, after all, a product of a number of factors indigenous to a given campus. It is the campus president in even the larger institution who can keep overall track of the educational program, the research thrust, and the services offered and the relationships between them. It is within the campus departments that the curriculum is actually fashioned and standards set and maintained. It rests with the individual departments, in coopeartion with campus central administration, which succeeds or fails in recruiting a qualified faculty. Of course, it is the individual faculty members who either do or do not do the research. Although Stanford University is a privately controlled institution, it is a single complex campus which, in a relatively short time (approximately 25 years) rose from being a strong regional institution catering to West Coast elite to one of the nation's most respected universities. An examination of some of the factors which have been involved in that qualitative leap may serve as an example which might be emulated in the public sector more appropriately than reliance on suprainstitutional headquarters.

Clear Institutional Purposes

The Leland Stanford Junior University is a privately controlled institution established in 1885 by Senator Leland Stanford and his wife, Jane Lathrop Stanford. It was built on 9,000 acres on the San Francisco Peninsula and financed through sustaining gifts and ultimately gifts for endowment from Senator and Mrs. Stanford. They decided on a threefold purpose for the new institution: research, the liberal education of undergraduates, and professional education of the highest quality. In the first decades of its life, the University failed to achieve all of its goals with uniform distinction, and it fell behind other similar institutions with respect to financial stability, quality of faculty, student enrollment, and variety of programs. Its original purposes prevailed, however; restated on a number of occasions following World War II, they guided virtually every decision of the institution. In the post-war period, Stanford undertook to evolve from a reasonably strong regional institution into a university of first rank nationally and internationally. It has subsequently become a major research university dedicated to achieving excellence in whatever it attempts.

There is abundant evidence that Stanford has achieved such excellence. Its faculty is well represented in such national disciplinary bodies as the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Education. Its professional schools are typically ranked among the top five in national reputation studies, as are over half of the departments in the School of Humanities and Sciences. It ranks high among American institutions in the volume of federal research grants and contracts it receives.

Centralized-Decentralized Governance

The University is governed and administered in a unique manner, at once centralized and decentralized. Its Board of Trustees, whose thirty-two members are elected by the Board itself and by alumni, is a strong active body. Although the Board has complete authority over every aspect of the institution, it conducts its business through Board Committees that include representatives of other campus constituencies, and it exercises its powers largely in consultation with those constituencies. For example, the President of the University is selected by committees of the Board of Trustees, the faculty, and students working in collaboration.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President responsibility for the overall conduct of the institution, subject only to the Board's approval or disapproval. When he became President of Stanford, J. Wallace Sterling remarked that, when he realized just how much power the President legally had, it frightened him. In practice, however, the President administers through a complex system of formal and informal consultation.

The President is assisted by five Vice Presidents in charge of Academic Affairs, Finance, Medical Affairs, Development, and Public Affairs. While all these report to the President, much of their work is orchestrated by the Academic Vice President and Provost--a unique position as it is interpreted at Stanford. The Provost's office is a clear extension of the power and influence of the President, who typically charges the Provost with overseeing academic planning, faculty development, academic land use, development priorities, and the budget. By coordinating these activities, the Provost is able to focus University operations and planning for the future. The Provost's office also plays an active role in reviewing recommendations for appointment, promotion, and tenure. In many institutions, review of such matters is almost *pro forma*, once approval has been given in departments and subordinate schools. At Stanford, the Provost is expected to make substantive judgments concerning personnel.

Other responsibilities for the administration of Stanford rest with a Vice Provost and Director of the Office of Management and Budget, a Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, a Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate studies, and an "Advisory Board to the President" made up of seven full professors elected by the faculty. This Board reviews all recommendations for faculty appointments, promotions, and advancement to tenure. At the request of the President, the Board also ponders matters of faculty discipline. In short, it advises the President on whatever matters he deems necessary.

The academic program of the University is carried on by the Schools of

Humanities and Sciences, Engineering, and Earth Sciences, which offer both undergraduate and graduate programs; and the Schools of Medicine, Law, Business, and Education, which are exclusively graduate. These seven schools have considerable autonomy in the conduct of their own affairs, the substance of the curricula they offer, the recruitment and development of faculty, and--in the case of the graduate and professional schools--the actual admission of students (provided that applicants meet a limited number of university-wide criteria). An important mark of their autonomy is that the schools may build up financial reserves, either by accumulating residual amounts from their appropriated budgets or through fund-raising activities of their own. The schools are organized in various ways; four have created relatively strong and autonomous academic departments, while the other three are comprised of less formal committees or areas. It is through the subordinate units of each school, whatever its structure, that most faculties can influence the actual day-to-day conduct of school affairs. Decisions regarding course offerings and the admission of graduate students, for example, are made in the actual departments or committees.

In addition to the schools and departments, there are a number of other large and autonomous units at Stanford, each with similar prerogatives regarding program and personnel. These include the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, the Stanford University Medical Center, the Hoover Institution, and the Stanford Libraries. The academic activities of all of these subordinate units are coordinated centrally, through the budgeting process and through procedures for the appointment of faculty and other professional personnel.

Coordination is further facilitated through the Academic Council, which since 1903 has been delegated responsibility for the educational program of the University. This body of more than 1200 members consists of the Professoriate and select officers of the academic administration, as specified in the Articles of

Organization of the Faculty. It exercises its responsibilities chiefly through an elected Senate which in effect, carries out all functions of the Council, subject only to the Council's own review and referendum. Since the Council itself is vested with the authority to discuss and decide upon all matters of policy within the province of the Faculty (subject in turn to the approval of the Board of Trustees), the work of the Senate is indeed far-reaching. Its committees include those on Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, Research, Libraries, Academic Appraisal and Achievement, and Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aids. The Senate approves degree programs, sets University-wide baccalaureate requirements, andestablishes policies regarding the conduct of graduate studies, admissions, and the awarding of financial aid. All major administrative officers discuss critical matters with the Senate and seek its advice. For example, the Provost reports several times during the academic year on the progress of budget development, and the Vice President for Business and Finance may report on matters such as land use planning. Further, the Senate's Committee on Committees nominates faculty for service on University (or Presidential) committees on matters such as the budget, athletics, faculty-staff benefits, land and building development, services to students, public events, and parking and transportation. The Senate may request to hear full reports on such matters and offer advice.

For the most part, the structure of governance and administration at Stanford appears to be well established, well received, and effective. This complex system of interacting elements has enabled the University to cope with rather pronounced student dissent in the late 1960s; with the distinct possibility of intolerable operating deficits during the 1970s; and with the careful planning of program and budget needed to maintain Stanford's excellence during the 1980s, when an overall slow-down is expected in higher education throughout the nation.

Faculty Excellence

Central to its mission and overall quality, the University believes, is its Professoriate. The Professoriate consists of all regular faculty at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor who have or are eligible for tenure, as well as all adjunct faculty at the rank of adjunct or (in medicine) "professor of clinical (subject)." It is expected, and the University policies are designed to insure, that the Professoriate will carry out the three major purposes of the University--research and scholarship, the liberal education of the undergraduates, and professional education.

Faculty quality is insured through elaborate search mechanisms in the case of initial appointments; and, in matters of re-appointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure, by equally elaborate procedures for review. Every search and review includes a careful evaluation of a candidate's scholarship; the obtaining of outside assessments of his or her reputation and quality (the judgments of knowledgeable scholars are critical, the University believes, as to a candidate's relative standing within each discipline or profession); and attention to evidence of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher in the unique kind of institution Stanford believes itself to be. In short, the University seeks the most outstanding men and women in the country or in the world for its faculty. Adjunct faculty are judged by standards as high as those for the regular faculty, but in terms of only one or the other of the two principal activities of teaching and research--both of which, of course, are required of the regular faculty. Appointments to adjunct professorships may be continuing or for terms up to six years; they do not carry traditional academic tenure. Stanford also makes use of advanced graduate students and postdoctoral students for some teaching and research activities. However, the chief responsibility for all academic matters rests with the Professoriate.

The University seeks to remunerate its faculty at rates comparable to other distinguished institutions. It offers benefits worth almost 20 percent of faculty salaries, including retirement and social security, various insurance programs, tuition assistance to children of employees, and the right to lease Stanford land on which to build homes.

It is expected that a faculty member's workload will be distributed among research, teaching and advising, and departmental, school, or university service and administration. The particular balance among these activities will vary somewhat from department to department and from school to school, as well as from one period of a faculty member's career to another. Overall, however, research and scholarship are expected to predominate. All faculty members are expected to prepare an annual report on their teaching, advising, committee work, research and scholarship, professional activities, and publications. In addition, they must secure student evaluations of their teaching periodically during each academic year. Of course, the performance of faculty members is carefully scrutinized in connection with any disciplinary action or charges brought by the President of the University.

Distinctive Characteristics

Stanford is in many respects like other research universities, but in some important ways quite different. First, as has been mentioned, there is a tradition of a strong President and a strong Provost assuming responsibility for the entire institutional effort and for helping to crystallize and define directions for the future. Coupled with such strong, centralized administration is a high level of decentralization, with a great deal of autonomy allowed the seven schools, their departments, and the other subordinate units of the University. Second, when Stanford elected to create a Senate, the Academic Council considered several possibilities; it finally decided on a Faculty Senate, to be designated the "Senate of the Academic Council," rather than a University Senate with representation from various constituencies. Third, Stanford has long had a policy of candor in its public relations, making every effort to insure that all constituencies of the institution are informed in detail regarding important developments in institutional life.

The Stanford example reveals several features which the existence of a supracampus agency would blunt or prevent. First of these is the high degree of decentralization of important authority to the individual schools and departments. It is the faculty of each of those units which is in the best position to decide on curricula, personnel, and intellectual thrust. Even the senate of the Academic Council assumes no oversight as to the substantive activities of the subordinate unit. Nor is there any formal sustained program review mandated by the central administration. It does attend to program quality when examining budgets and appointments, but program review, in the sense that periodically a group of outsiders visit and comment on program quality, is a nonexistent phenomenon. A new program at Stanford, for example an evaluation training program in the School of Education, can be decided by the School of Education alone deciding how best it might use its authorized number of positions and its base budget. This contrasts sharply with the process typical of any of the highly organized multi-campus institutions in coordinated state arrangements.

Also of significance in the Stanford example is the highly visible status of the President and Provost, who are expected to speak out on academic and intellectual matters, who are listened to, and who have a direct personal voice in the decisions about appointment and budget. They consult widely but, ultimately, exercise their own individual judgments which are likely to be qualitatively different than the impersonal judgments of an extended hierarchy of educational bureaucrats.

It will, of course, be argued that such freedom is possible in a private institution but would be inappropriate in public institutions with responsibilities to meet state educational requirements and be accountable for the prudent expenditure of tax monies. It is argued that these statewide concerns can only be insured through agencies above the campus level. Lee and Bowen become almost rhapsodic as they analyze nine multi-campus institutions: "With a few exceptions, the increase in systemwide activity has been meritorious. Academic planning and program review are more comprehensive and of higher quality, budgeting is technically more sophisticated and more sensitive to academic criteria, multi-campus programs are increasing, faculty personnel planning is being initiated, and student mobility is being facilitated. To be sure, few of these activities are limited to multi-campus systems; indeed, the experiences of individual campuses, public and private, offer many lessons for systemwide administrators. But the record is sound. Multi-campus systems have made a difference for students, for faculty, and for the educational enterprise of their states. The difference has been positive--more so, we believe, than would have been the case had the policies and decisions described in earlier chapters been the responsibility of single campuses, whether dealing with each other as autonomous institutions or dealing directly with state executive and legislative officials and with coordinating agencies" (Lee and Bowen, 1975, p. 146).

However, throughout their comprehensive review of nine systems, there are statements which raise questions as to whether or not the systems are achieving their purposes effectively. Thus, the authors describe in reasonable detail the various plans which have been developed by the systems headquarters of multi-campus institutions. However, the same detail is lacking with respect to actual accomplishments, except for negative ones or effective examples which were the result of accident or a particular individual. Thus, the six campuses of the University of Texas were created not as a result of comprehensive planning but of ad hoc decisions over time, and political pressures are such in New York that a particular neighborhood can force converting a community college into a four-year one at almost any time. Program review, which in theory should be concerned with quality, is described essentially as an economic device which can generate a moratorium on development of new programs or slow down the process of creating new programs. My own impression is that, except for certain gross decisions such as denying doctoral-level work in the California State University and College System, a reasonably persevering campus can, over time, both maintain existing but unproductive programs and create new ones. It is perhaps significant that the two examples of comprehensive system-based review of existing academic programs indicated, in the case of the University of Missouri, that the sytemwide administration was pleased with the results although no results were mentioned. In the other example, the University of Wisconsin, the major result was the phasing out of 51 marginal programs, resulting only in minimal cost savings.

With respect to innovative development of new programs in the system, Lee and Bowen point out what theoretically could be done, observing that "the multicampus system would seem to enjoy several advantages in the search for new approaches; it can be a source of financial and technical support for campuses, but limit risk to one campus; it can be an objective judge of experimental success or failure; it has interior lines of communication to transfer successful programs to wider, perhaps captive, audiences" (Lee & Bowen, 1975, p. 77). However, what is lacking is the dramatic example to show that those potentialities were actually realized. They mentioned the Empire State College of the State University of New York as an important innovation, but, as of this writing, it has served only a tiny minority of people receiving Bachelor's degrees from New York public institutions. They also cite some of the efforts to establish non-traditional external degree programs in California. However, actual programs seem to have flowered only on campuses the chief exectutives of which have a long-time personal commitment to external degree activities as, for example, the campus of Dominguez Hills.

To understand why suprainstitutional agencies such as multi-campus institutions cannot be shown to have positively influenced educational, research or service quality, the claimed elements of an exemplary model should be examined. "Continuing and conscious awareness that most decisions, most of the time, are better made at campuses than centrally.

"Equal awareness that some decisions--often the hardest ones--must be made by the central administration and the governing board.

"The best possible information--historical, current, and projected--about programs and needs, coupled with judicious use of such information for more informed decisions at both campus and statewide levels.

"Flexibility within the multi-campus system to employ budgetary resources effectively among campuses--and at the campus level, among programs--to insure diversity and specialization in a period of increasing physical constraints.

"Equitable procedures for dealing with personnel retrenchment, and positive programs of intercampus mobility to soften the impact of faculty layoffs.

"Regional and systemwide academic programs which attract and engage the abilities of faculty and students beyond the horizons of a single campus.

"Systemwide capacity--both technical and at the highest policy levels--for institutional self-analysis, evaluation, and change.

"Ongoing efforts to mobilize energies of campus administrators, faculty and students to seek solutions not only at their campuses but within the system as a whole" (Lee and Bowen, 1975, p. 149). This model assumes that significant academic decision making is a rational one and, by implication, that there are persuasive examples demonstrating that rationality. Both of these can be disputed. Decision making in colleges and universities can be incremental (plus or minus the status quo), bureaucratic, political, capricious or accidental, or rational. A review of a number of presumably significant academic decisions throughout the country suggests a variety of modes. Thus, the decision of Fordham University to create Ben Salem College in 1967 was reached almost capriciously in connection with a lunch conversation of the president of the institution and a faculty member-poet. Similarly, the decision of the University of California to create the Santa Cruz campus in the form of many small colleges seems to have been an inspiration of the President, Clark Kerr, conditioned by his own undergraduate experience at Swarthmore. The decision of the University of Wisconsin to create the Green Bay campus as a distinctively innovative institution was first of all political--the demand of that region of the state for a state university presence--and the instinct of the President of the University of Wisconsin that, in view of the times, there should be an innovative campus of some sort. The far-reaching decision of Dartmouth to become coeducational illustrates political effort of a most sensitive quality.

The record of supracampus agencies reaching rational decisions through sophisticated use of information which proved, in the long run, to be effective, is not particularly good. During the late 1960s, virtually none anticipated or made plans for an eventual stabilization of demand, although information of that likelihood in the form of census data, birth and fertility rates, was available. In 1972, the Federal Higher Education Amendments provided for a presumably rational system of commissions in each state which would facilitate the planning for and use of growing amounts of Federal subsidies. Essentially, the concept proved to be unattainable, as the various states adopted other means of anticipating and providing for the future. West Virginia, for a variety of reasons, embraced the idea of vigorous statewide coordination, and a system was put into effect under experienced and presumably capable leadership. The result was a hodge-podge of educational activity

Perhaps the biggest single reason for being skeptical about the efficacy of suprainstitutional influence on the actual practice of higher education is the manifest tendency for institutions to react to unexpected events. Sometimes the reaction has been plausible and produced beneficial results, but frequently reactions have been detrimental. Of the major qualitative developments in American higher education since the beginning of World War II, only one appears to have resulted from academics examining their enterprise, finding it wanting, and attempting to do something about it. That was the general education movement, although even its expansion was intimately related to the flood of veteran enrollments at the end of the second world war. The cooperative venture of the Federal government and universities in developing a sophisticated research effort and apparatus stemmed directly from the unexpectedly fruitful cooperative effort with war-related research. It is true that some academics sensed what was likely to happen and attempted to prepare for it, but the flowering of reserach in the major research universities was not something that had long been planned for. Similarly, the expansion of high-quality graduate programs stemmed in part from the growing need of the research apparatus for people who could make it function. Additionally, that expansion was driven by the collective decision of the post World War II baby boom to attend college. Obviously, those increased numbers would require teachers, and the graduate schools represented the only agency which could produce the needed numbers rather quickly. The same pressure of numbers stimulated the move toward high selectivity on the part of those institutions which were reasonably well known and which did not choose to expand indiscriminately. The increased concern with academic rigor which characterized the 1960s was not the result of a thoughtful analysis and a rational decision to impose more stringent standards; rather it was almost a knee-jerk reaction to the public outcry over the launching of the first Russian satellite.

If there is no persuasive evidence that supracampus agencies facilitate campus accomplishment of fundamental purpose and that the demonstrable gains, such as more elaborate data and precise budgeting formulas, are of marginal value, it is proper to ask why such agencies are sustained and continue to grow in size, complexity, and influence. There is no clear answer to such a question. However, there is room for reasonable speculation. First, there is the logical elegance of the rhetoric used to defend such agencies. The syllogism runs thusly: As higher education moves into a period of stability and restricted resources, it is imperative that those resources be managed well and there there is no costly duplication of educational services. Therefore, coordinating boards or consolidated boards of control or systems of campuses are essential to manage those resources. Expressions of that syllogism are embellished with value claims, such as the protection of academic freedom, preservation of diversity, stimulation of innovation and best serving the common welfare. That logic and accompanying value claims become plausible when one recognizes that in most states there are too many separate campuses to allow them all to deal directly with the executive and legislative branches of government. Some fewer number of direct links is essential if legistlative chaos is not to result. However, that particular purpose could be achieved by relatively small staffs collecting and collating campus budget requests and forwarding them to the governor and legislature with explanatory comment. Centralized agencies seek to do much more, including the preparation of consolidated budgets, substantive review of program plans, and deliberate allocation of resources through the several campuses. In the case of multi-campus institutions, chief executives of the system assume a major role in the appointment of campus executives, substantive review of indigenous campus problems, and maintaining actual control over the professorial positions available for every campus. However, there is no evidence to suggest that a system president better selects capable campus executives than would local campus search committees. Nor is there evidence that system officers are better able to judge program quality from documents and site visits than could interacting elements of faculties on a local campus. There is really a kind of arrogance when system officers contend they frequently will use the budget mechanism to force a campus to discontinue an ineffective program.

One reason that these agencies are sustained is that they exist and have developed influential bureaucracies. Efforts to eliminate these agencies when they have demonstrably failed, as was true in Colorado and in Florida, have not proven successful. Those bureaucracies gain strength from the occasional support of a campus which believes the bureaucracy might help in the competition with other campuses. For example, as Virginia Polytechnic Institute began to grow, its leadership supported statewide coordination, in the belief that VPI would gain with coordination and that the University of Virginia might very well lose. They also gain strength as bureaucrats gain sophistication with such things as esoteric budget and planning systems. One can argue that the expansion of quantitative systems such as those developed by Nechems primarily accomplishes an expansion and an entrenching of suprainstitutional bureaucracies. Fear also plays an important part of generating campus support of a systems arrangement or a coordinating board, in the belief that those agencies might prevent an even more onerous centralized system of controls, such as a consolidated board that has a large staff to mandate all collegiate institutions in the state. The spectre is constantly raised that if a state did not have a coordinating board, other state agencies and bureaus would undoubtedly begin to exercise tight control but without sensitivity to essential educational values. Consider, for example, the remark, that ". . . boards which fail to come to grips with state internal priorities will find those decisions made for them by governors and legislatures" (Berdahl, 1975, p. 18).

One can also theorize that the rather steady increase in size of professional staffs above the campus level might result from a surplus of educational professionals who cannot be absorbed into campus administration and governance. The creation of large bureaucracies is a way of utilizing, for example, the products of the 70 some odd programs in higher education which produce aspiring administrators, neither needed nor wanted by individual campuses. This is probably not an explicit rationale but results from many individual decisions of professional bureaucrats, producers of those professionals, and individuals. The doctoral program in administration and policy analysis in the School of Education, Stanford University, for example, has in the 1970s concentrated on cultivating bureaucratic vacancies for its graduates and preparing those graduates to employ complex and esoteric quantitative techniques of management--the very techniques which can consolidate suprainstitutional influence. It would be tempting to infer a conspiracy on the part of Federal higher educational programs, state higher educational organizations, visible educational leaders seeking to influence policy, and a variety of agencies concerned with the study of an increasingly complicated system of higher education. That would be wrong, although the result of an expanding suprainstitutional bureaucracy is the same as though a conspiracy did in fact exist.

While there is no evidence that supracampus organizations affect educational and academic quality in any way other than adversely, and the performance with respect to other missions was quite checkered, nonetheless, these agencies seem likely to persist and, very likely (given their bureaucratic nature), to seek to expand power and influence. Nonetheless, a variety of measures can be taken to minimize that expansion and to restore considerable responsibility to individual campuses, which is where the quality issues must be resolved.

First, the recommendations of major policy-recommending groups should be carefully pondered and injected more frequently into public debate regarding the structure of higher education, although the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education sponsored one significant apology for multi-campus systems (Lee and Bowen, 1975). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which sponsored the council, took a reasonably firm position opposed to the expansion of control above campuses. It regretted the tendency toward centralization of authority from the campus to the multi-campus systems and from governing boards to state mechanisms. It believed such movement reduced the influence of students and faculty members and campus administrators who know most about the institution, and who are most directly involved. Further, it pointed out that centralization seemed to have had neither a measurable direct impact on policies or practices, nor was there any evidence that higher education was in any way better because of centralization. The Foundation recognized that institutions of higher education could not proceed without restraints but that the best restraints were competition between campuses and the limitations imposed by the state budget.

The Board of Trustees of the Foundation, however, weakened its case somewhat by insisting upon the urgency of long-range planning and implied that this, very likely, should be done at the state level. It tempered that belief by suggesting that such planning be done through advisory councils without power over operating decisions. Since such a utopian view of planning is likely never to take place, the net effect of the foundation's recommendation is to establish a rationale for coordinating councils and consolidated boards to increase both planning and controlling activities. The board position was in many respects an inconsistent one, although probably made necessary by the existence of control agencies above the campus. It favored the presence of lay boards with substantial powers at the campus level within multi-campus and consolidated systems. The Board still believed it unwise for states not to have statewide planning agencies. The Board of Trustees was essentially recognizing the reality of politics when it described a continuum of more and less desirable mechanisms. The most desirable seemed to be considerable authority given to campuses, but with some statewide mechanism with limited power to conduct planning and to coordinate campus activities. A less desirable, but still tolerable, arrangement would be a consolidated board for higher education which would perceive itself as part of higher education and not outside of it. However, the statewide consolidated board presented weaknesses with respect to planning and with respect to homogenizing individual campuses. It might be better public policy for states to create several competitive institutions or segments, which would allow the marketplace to operate to some degree. The worst situation was seen as the creation of state regulatory agencies, pointing out that the staffs of such boards tend, more often than not, to come from outside higher education.

The same equivocation, but with the same underlying suspicion of above-campus controlling mechanisms was present in the Second Newman Report. It recognized the powerful trend of shifting from individual campuses to multi-campus systems and statewide systems. It suggested advantages and disadvantages to that shift. It argued that "given the growth in the number of institutions, and the size of budgets, some system of organization and management of institutions is required. It is manifestly impossible for a legislature to supervise the operation of 30 or 50 or 100 campuses. The use of the multi-campus system concept is thus a logical outcome of growth" (Newman, 1973, p. 55). It further recognized a need for coordination to facilitate planning. While the Newman Report also acknowledged some achievements of such agencies as, for example, the experiments in open universities in New York and Minnesota, they also recognized the danger and likelihood of continuous expansion of power and influence and the lessening of responsibility for individual campuses, where the critical actions regarding education should take place. When the organizational revolution of movement of power to supracampus agencies was joined with increased Federal involvement, increased judicial interest, and increased unionization, the power of individual campuses to conduct education was seriously attenuated.

The Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education was more tolerant of supra campus organizations. Although it did oppose state agencies getting into the controlling act, it accepted the inevitability of higher education boards but believed they could be improved by strengthening the quality of individual board members. It took an especially dangerous position by recommending that each state arrange for periodic reviews of the quality of educational programs at every public college and university. It pointed out that the reviews should be made by academic people rather than bureaucrats, and that voluntary accreditation should be centrally involved. The very admission that state agencies should review programs represented an untested and potentially dangerous doctrine.

Even the thoughtful apologists for multi-campus systems argued that most decisions, most of the time, were better made on campuses than centrally. Their overall point of view was that there should be creative use of a unique organizational structure combining coordination and governance. "Coordination implies a continuing high level of campus autonomy--the prerogative of the campuses to promote their own institutional stamp and style. Governance, on the other hand, implies that central administration has direct operational responsibility and is accountable to the state for the sum of activity across campuses. The tension between campus and central responsibility cannot be resolved by abandoning either" (Lee and Bowen, 1975, p. 148).

One salutary development would be for higher educational leaders and theorists to reconsider their formal statements as to the inevitability of suprainstitutional control and to call into question the validity of argument as to what those agencies can do. As earlier pointed out, it was argued that the steady state of the 1980s and 1990s required sophisticated planning and that this could be best done by agencies concerned with statewide needs. This implies the feasibility of creating a reasonably detailed rational plan which institutions can follow with reasonable fidelity. There is another defensible point of view, that planning ideally is a process within which those most concerned with the actual practices of higher education discuss significant questions and that out of such discussion emerges a consensus as to where an institution is going. This point of view suggests that a reasonably sophisticated outsider could draw up a logical, coherent plan for almost any institution after some relatively little exposure to it. That plan very likely would produce no real changes in the institution. This point of view argues that the planning process is most important in strengthening academic communities and establishing consensus, a process which is not possible beyond the campus domain.

Similarly, it is argued that program review requires disinterested effort by agencies above the campus level. Again, this argument can be questioned. It implies that participants on campus have such deep vested interest as to preclude recommending hard decisions, yet an examination of a few private institutions such as Stanford or Vanderbilt reveals a great deal of responsible objectivity when pondering institutional needs. There is a different point of view which suggests that program review is also a process in which those most intimately involved ponder what they are doing and might do in the future, and that out of such discussion would gradually emerge consensus. This notion suggests that program review would best take place in departments, divisions, and in separate schools in complex institutions. A less desirable scheme would be for central administration of the campus to attempt reviews of its component elements, and the further removed from the locale of actual educational effort, the less valid and productive review exercises are likely to be.

It is also argued that wise allocation of scarce financial resources requires scrutiny and decision above the campus level, and, indeed, this is ultimately true, as legislatures make appropriations decisions. To argue that staff members in systems headquarters or in offices of coordinating agencies have greater insight as to program needs and possibilities than individuals on a campus, who are attuned to local needs and conditions, is to assign greater insight to staff officers above the campus than they probably possess. A systems staff officer might contend that a Ph.D. program in English, for example, was not warranted because other campuses maintained such programs, but without understanding that a Ph.D. program in English on a given campus was a highly desirable political decision to keep the English faculty involved in the total campus community.

In many respects, the case for supracampus agencies is strengthened and made plausible by examples of campus over-aggressiveness and even campus greed. Thus, when a campus manipulates budgetary approval to enter doctoral work, not with any real intent to create programs, but essentially to gain increased funding through a formula which grants higher appropriations to doctoral degree-granting institutions, the case for monitoring campuses is strengthened. When a campus uses the political power of the community in which it is located to gain approval for a new medical school when an oversupply of medical doctors in the region is a reality, the case for strengthening the powers of supracampus agencies is enhanced. Overall, it may be likely that the best defense against growing centralization is for individual campuses to perform more responsibly with respect to claims and aspirations made and to the need for and validity of programs offered.

In this connection, a most healthy point of view would be for appropriate campuses to accept declines in traditional enrollments and demand for programs and to tailor requests for appropriations accordingly. Too frequently the argument is advanced that, although enrollments seem about to decline, for the sake of quality, expenditures should continue to advance. As the 1970s began and institutional leadership realized that within a decade there would be a decline in the number of 18- to 20-year-olds, intensive efforts were made to find new markets. Off-campus programs proliferated, and on campus, new programs were developed which would attract many different kinds of enrollments. Further, institutions sought approval for upgrading programs to graduate levels, especially the doctoral level, becuase of the formula-created financial advantage for campuses offering doctoral level work. Now, some efforts were probably warranted. However, the impression persists that campus effort to prevent decline and even to increase enrollment through new programs created a powerful reason for the creation of some agency or agencies which could contain these aggressive tendencies. Were campuses less expansive, it is likely that demands for accountability, program review, coordination, and control would be less imperative. A counter argument to this position is that campus leadership has a responsibility to maintain faculty positions and to safeguard what has been called the private life of the campus, consisting of the many personal relations among individuals and groups on campus, and the spirit and tone of the campus. This responsibility can only be fulfilled through constant effort to find new ways of growth when historic directions have proven to be infeasible. However humanitarian such an argument might be, it may, in the long run, be more detrimental to institutional freedom and autonomy and even educational quality. A regional state institution in Western Illinois of 15,000 full-time equivalent students might, in the long run, be stronger by accepting a reduction to 10,000 students on campus than through maintaining that 15,000 enrollment by creating off-campus centers, even located in bordering states.

One important way by which public campuses could blunt the demand for accountability and control might be to follow the self-restraining practices of private institutions which have remained vital and in strong intellectual and financial health. Such private institutions, recognizing the financial limitations of tuition, endowment, and gift income, have been unwilling to attempt new programs and expansion beyond their capability. They have recognized that the maintenance of quality requires concentration on those things the institution has been able to do best. If public campuses exercised similar restraint, it can be theorized that supracampus control would be less potent. Spokesmen for public institutions would obviously argue that, as publicly mandated and supported activities, they must be responsive to public needs and demands, and, to a certain extent, this is true. However, presumed public demands have been used as a justification for entry into activities really, primarily, for purposes of institutional growth and aggrandizement. Here a variety of rhetorical questions can be raised. For example, one can wonder to what extent the insatiable expansionism of California public two-year community colleges, supported as they were primarily by property tax, contributed to the disenchantment which led to the overwhelming passage of Proposition 13 which limited property taxes. Self-restraint on the part of those institutions might have produced a different outcome. Similarly, one can wonder as to the relationship between the creation and planned-for expansion of two University of Wisconsin universities and the statewide decision to create a single board which could control growth and program development throughout the state. In the late 1960s, the Board of curators of the University of Missouri took over the previously private University of Kansas City and expanded the two-year St. Louis branch to the status of a comprehensive university. The original plan was that the four campuses would be loosely coordinated, so that they might better respond to the needs of the communities they served. However, both the University of Missouri, Kansas City, and the University of Missouri, St. Louis, embarked on aggressive expansion which included stressing graduate work and research. The very aggressiveness of the campuses led the second president of the multi-campus system to increase control over campuses so as to insure that institutional growth did not exceed the state's resources. Although it can never be known, there is room for speculation that, had the campuses been more parsimonious in their plans, tight central control might have been prevented.

Harold H. Enarson personnifies a reason why supracampus control will persist, even if it achieves little (Enarson, 1980, pp. 7-10). He correctly identifies scores of errors of suprainstitutional control, such as masses of unnecessary paperwork, overly detailed financial accounting, and overregulation of campus program development, and he spots the underlying cynicism leading to the creation of controlling agencies. "In shifting power and accountability from local boards of lay trustees to state boards of lay members, it is essential to assert the proposition that lay members of the state boards are more high minded, more sensitive to the public weal, more attuned to the realities of teaching, research and academic freedom than are members of the local institutional boards." Then he gave away his whole case by arguing that there were two areas in which it was desirable and, perhaps, essential that coordinating agencies or other regulatory bodies take the lead. "First, coordinating boards are the appropriate agencies to decide which programs and institutions will best meet the needs of the 1980s. To leave those decisions to individual institutions is to invite a 'tragedy of the commons' . . . clearly no institution will voluntarily phase out a high-cost, low-enrollment program if competing institutions with similar programs do not do likewise, even though failure to cut back may destroy the programs everywhere. Second, institutions will look to coordinating agencies for help in meeting new needs and formulating essential programs for the 1980s because, despite the constraints we will face in this decade, we cannot afford to let higher education stagnate." A much better argument would have been to assume that campuses can discipline themselves and can generate the innovations needed for the future without the intrusion of agencies above the campus level.

Chapter XI

Graduate Education

Especially since the beginning of the 1970s there has evolved a worriesome fear that the quality of graduate education has declined which in turn produces qualitative decline in undergraduate education, research and high level service. A variety of observations indicate the dimensions of such fears. Too many essentially undergraduate comprehensive institutions entered graduate education, including production of doctorates without the needed critical mass of a sophisticated faculty, adequate library holdings and essential laboratory equipment. As surpluses of doctorates in the principal academic fields deepened the most capable potential doctoral candidates elected to seek other careers such as in law, with the result of a general decline in ability of those actually enrolling in doctoral programs. Graduate education experienced, along with undergraduate education, serious grade inflation to such an extent that appropriate standards of performance in courses virtually disappeared allowing both the adequately and the inadequately prepared candidates to move through the Ph.D. degree pipeline. As established graduate programs expanded and as many new programs were created the student-faculty ratios grew to such an extent that the sustained individual interaction between a student and a faculty member deemed an essential of graduate education was no longer possible. Horror tales abounded of graduate advisors being nominally responsible for 20 or 30 candidates each, whereas the desired ratio would be no more than 4 or 5 advisees, with a desired median being perhaps 2 or 3. As the concept of external degrees took hold, many new institutions created doctoral programs requiring little contact with faculty and less than rigorous work being done on dissertations. As pressures for affirmative action intensified, it has been alleged that many poorly prepared women and minority group students were admitted into graduate programs without the requisite skills to handle sophisticated graduate work. It has been argued that this produced either murderously high attrition rates or allowed incompetent individuals actually to acquire advanced graduate degrees.

It should be pointed out that there is virtually no hard and persuasive evidence that there has indeed been qualitative decline, However, the criticisms and claims of decline often come from prudent, informed and respected observers and should be seriously examined with a first step reviewing historical criticisms of graduate education and the major developments taking place in graduate education, especially since the end of World War II.

Until the purposes of graduate education are clarified and coherent and consistent models developed, the relationship between graduate education and what professors do will remain casual, frequently irrelvant, and more often than not, dysfunctional. It should be stressed that the chances of a general, institution by institution, review and clarification of purpose of graduate education are remote. From the time the first doctorates were awarded through the mid-1970s there has been a steady tattoo of criticism, while the essential objects of criticism have remained essentially unchanged. The litany of criticism is all too familiar: Doctoral work is too highly specialized. It prepares people for research but not for teaching, which most doctoral recipients do as their major professional activity. Programs are too long and the attrition rate among candidates too high. Requirements, including examinations, are irrelevant and some so discretionary with the professor as to be capricious.

The Masters degree is even less understood than the doctorate. It can be evidence of survival of one more year of courses, it can be the first step toward a research-based Ph.D., it can be a consolation prize for losers in the doctoral race. It has often been unsuccessfully urged as an appropriate replacement for the Ph.D. as an appropriate preparation for college teaching. In a few technical fields it represents clear and well developed technical competence.

All of those things are still being said, but in addition several new dimensions are present in the 1980s which render the task of understanding the relationship between graduate education and the marketplace even more incomprehensible. First and well predating the 1970s, is the plethora of earned degrees in the United States, most of which may be presumed to be graduate degrees of one sort or another. There are probably 1600 different earned degree titles available, but no generally accepted theory which can help determine nomenclature. There appears no acceptable distinction between a Master of Arts and a Master of Science. One institution may award a Master of Arts in Education while another awards the Master of Education, while still another awards the Master of Arts in Teaching. Yet all degrees may be substantially the same in content and in purpose. Generally there is a bit more agreement as to the length of time a Masters program requires--one to two years--but the substance of what is studied in that time may vary from the quite casual pursuit of discrete courses freely elected, to a tightly prescribed curriculum, such as is found in some Masters of Business Administration. Since there is no agreement as to the nature of the Masters degree, including the research component, there is no agreement as to the qualifications needed for professors in Masters programs. Similar confusion surrounds the doctorate. The Ph.D. is theoretically supposed to represent research competence, but it is increasingly awarded in fields such as Education or Nursing to individuals who lack that competence and who do not aspire to engage in scholarly work. Education is a particularly interesting field. The Doctor of Education was created to prepare practitioners, yet when recipients of the Ed.D. degree and Ph.D. degree in education were compared ten years after receipt of the degrees there were no essential differences from the standpoint of career between the two groups. Both were teaching in collegiate institutions and doing virtually no research. The meaninglessness of any distinction between the two was well revealed in the late 1960s when institutions began to modify the foreign language requirement. Once it became possible for candidates to obtain a Ph.D. without passing German and French examinations the number of Ph.D.s in education awarded began to increase and the number of Ed.D. degrees to decrease. The situation in 1981 is such that employers of graduate degree recipients experienced extraordinary difficulty in deciding on the basis of degree alone just what competencies the individual possesses.

Of much more recent origin is the enormous expansion of graduate enrollments and the over-production of graduate degree holders. The roots of this phenomenon are several and quite revealing. There, of course, was the post-World War II entry of the federal government into the support of research. Federal policy made research profitable for some institutions and also encouraged institutions to expand graduate enrollments to provide inexpensive labor for research projects and to prepare future researchers needed by what was presumed would be a continuing exponential increase in the amount of research done. Federal policy also seems to have joined with credentialing policies of the states to expand the numbers of available teachers possessing at least one graduate degree. By forgiving portions of loans made to college students who would enter teaching, larger numbers of people were drawn into such work than the market could absorb. States and state school systems by increasing credential requirements and by linking salary to earned credentials stimulated larger numbers of prospective teachers to continue in graduate school, although frequently in a quite casual manner. There was also the argument advanced that an increasingly technological economy required more and more highly trained workers and that graduate work was the appropriate way to produce those workers. A different sort of force was the implicit fear on the part of individuals that given the steadily increasing enrollments in bachelors degree programs, the bachelors degree would quickly lose its economically competitive advantage. Hence the way to ensure the position of preferment would be to obtain a graduate degree of some sort. To these major factors should be added several contributing factors. During the 1960s some 200 liberal arts colleges began offering masters programs, chiefly as a means of satisfying faculty desires to offer graduate work. Developing institutions in the public sector sought legislative approval to enter doctoral level work, even with no experience nor perceptible capability, in order to qualify for higher formula support from state governments and the insidious concept of comprehensiveness contributed. During the 1960s the comprehensive research-oriented university became an ideal institution offering limited amounts of graduate work and in pursuit of the ideal of becoming comprehensive, encouraged schools and departments to strengthen themselves until they had received the accolade of permission to offer the doctorate.

Such factors led developed and developing institutions to over-produce the number of graduate degree recipients from the standpoint of absorption of those individuals in the market. Carter, for example, has projected the market need for as few as 7,000 to 9,000 new Ph.D.s per year, while between 30,000 and 35,000 are likely to be produced each year. Another phenomenon has emerged, based in part on these factors but also in part on a romantic egalitarianism in the United States, which comes close to arguing that virtually anyone who wishes an advanced degree is entitled to one, and that much of an individual's life or work experience can be properly counted as fulfilling even the majority of degree requirements. In the past few years new kinds of institutions have sprung up to offer graduate work on terms affordable to the individual and profitable to the institution and even well established institutions have been led in a similar direction, either through altruism or from economically competitive pressure. Several examples may illustrate the phenomenon. Nova University in Florida, with an enrollment of slightly over 4,000 students, ranging from elementary school to the Ph.D., offers three doctoral programs and one law program, with combined enrollments of 2,500. The tuition from these four programs provide the basic support which keeps the entire institution reasonably solvent. Another institution offers teachers a masters degree for completing an on-the-job project and attending some workshop-type seminars. This so cut into the part-time graduate enrollents of other nearby institutions as to force them to greater leniency in requirements for their own graduate programs. A number of institutions seem to have entered masters work either as a revenue-producing activity or as a kind of unplanned doing what seemed to be natural. One institution, for example, stressing non-traditional education, typically awarded bachelors degrees for the completion of one year of quasi-academic work and the receipt of three years of credit for work experience. Those individuals could then move directly into a masters program conducted similarly, so that by the end of the second year an individual having completed only high school could obtain both the bachelors and the masters degrees. Through arrangements with a freestanding Ph.D. degree granting institution, one more year of work (consisting of one five-week summer session, completion of a thesis and a two-week summer session) could have earned a Ph.D. The more casually evolving entry into graduate work is revealed from the observation about one rather widely publicized institution: that it was important to point out that the goals stated in the beginning were borrowed from the undergraduate program and not grounded in past experiences with the type of very experimental program for MA students that the institution offered. This particular institution had developed no concept of the specific roles the masters degree was preparing individuals to fill.

The situation in 1980 regarding graduate education can be quickly summarized. Enrollments and varieties of degrees and programs continue to expand, although rates slowed. There continues to be great uncertainty as to the purposes of graduate education, either at the masters, the intermediate or the doctoral level. The production of graduate degree recipients has expanded to such an extent that in many, if indeed not the majority of fields, there is a serious over-supply in the light of what the existing markets can absorb. There has been substantial entry into graduate education on the part of new institutions and institutions with no previous graduate education experience. Yet the public regard for graduate education remains high and individuals will pay at least moderate amounts to obtain the designation of master or doctor.

Many different organizations, commissions, and agencies have pondered these and related matters and have made recommendations. These recommendations reflect four or five different postures. The first assumes that graduate education is good unto itself and that the larger the proportion of the population provided graduate education the greater the improvement of the general culture. Spokesmen for this position, such as Howard Bowen of the Clarement Graduate School, do not reject the vocational. Rather, he argues that there are so many needed services that only a continued increase in graduate programs can provide those highly trained individuals. Thus the task is not to curtail graduate enrollments, but to obtain state and federal support for such programs, as well as support for the activities in which graduates will be engaged.

At the opposite end is the point of view that there has been overproduction and that through state policy and federal granting policy the production, especially in some fields, should be curtailed. This is reflected in the reduction of the number of federal fellowships and traineeships and the curtailment of federal support for basic research. Within the states it is reflected by legislatures seeking to impose graduate enrollment ceilings and by coordinating counsels to evaluate all public graduate programs and to eliminate weak or unneeded ones.

A third posture, and one favored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as well as the National Board on Graduate Education, is a politically balanced one which seemingly provides guidelines. The National Board on Graduate Education, for example, in its report *Federal Policy Alternatives for Graduate Education* stresses elitism--"strengthening the national structure for graduate education, scholarship and research by supporting strong programs currently in existence in all regions and insuring that the most talented students are not denied access to these programs," restraint and innovation--"by discouraging the proliferation of graduate programs, while insuring that universities have the necessary resources to develop programs in new fields of study and to meet new social needs," egalitarianism--"by insuring that graduate education contributes to the national commitment to eliminate discrimination based on race, sex, age and socioeconomic status . . . and encouraging responsiveness to the needs of students, including the development of graduate programs that serve part-time and older students, as well as the needs of urban residents," and academic freedom--"protecting the freedom and the adaptive capacity of the nation's universities."

A fourth posture is to recommend changes in degree structures and to differentiate degrees according to anticipated roles recipients will fill and the differential needs of people. Thus the Doctor of Arts is recommended as the appropriate degree for undergraduate teachers. The Doctor of Psychology or the Doctor of Education is urged as appropriate for practitioners, while the Ph.D. is maintained as preparation for future scholars. The most thoughtfully reasoned proposal is that of Stephen H. Spurr in his Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches. Spurr first of all urges a decrease in the number of different degrees and then clearly eliminating the time candidates spend in acquiring each degree. Thus the Associate Degree is two years, the Bachelors four years, the Masters five to six years, the intermediate degree six to seven years and the doctorate seven or more years. He argues that each degree should be regarded as an end in itself and that the possession of a degree in no way predetermines an individual to move into the next level.

The fifth posture neither addresses the problems of numbers, nor does it address the validity of much graduate work. It assumes the validity and covertly understood purposes and seeks chiefly to improve through manipulation of programmatic details. Institutions are urged to place limits on the time required to obtain a degree. Depending on the time and the composition of the faculty, more or less description is attempted. Depending on the time and the faculty, examinations are changed either from the general to the specific or vice versa. Foreign language requirements are modified, statistics are added as a requirement, and greater interdisciplinary work is encouraged.

A more radical approach can be suggested, although the odds are substantially against it being seriously considered. The net effect of such a radical proposal would be a likely reduction in the number of graduate programs and enrollments. This need not be a bad thing.

Perhaps the first essential is to clarify what a university is and what it is not. March argues that the university does not have a comparative advantage, vis-a-vis other social institutions in many domains. He argues "It ought not to be a general-purpose social institution. . . . The university as a special domain of competence: The domain of the intellect. What the university does best, relative to other institutions, is to develop new knowledge and its implications. It is an intellectual institution." While universities have done other things, their primary claim is an intellectual one, and while changes are likely in the future, regardless of the shifts in social needs, the university should retain the same basic specialization (Mayhew, 1974, pp. 44-45). This author makes the same point, contending universities are not clinics, sanctuaries, or political asylums and that colleges and universities cannot do all the things their catalogs say they do. Talking about undergraduate institutions, this author remarks: Liberal Arts Colleges cannot prepare the number of vocations implied by the various professional and preprofessional curricula listed. Graduate Schools of Education with existing resources cannot prepare the many different specialists they claim the profession needs, nor can schools of business, journalism, librarianship or social work. . . . Colleges and universities are well designed to do a few things. They can occupy the time to late adolescents until the work force is ready for them. They can develop or improve language and other skills. They can provide some time for the young to think about themselves and who they are. They can instill a limited amount of generally needed information to enable people to communicate with each other. They can create opportunities for young people of the same age group to interact with each other. They can train some students in the particular skills needed in some vocations, but by no means all or even a majority.

In the context of a more parimonious view of what an institution can and cannot properly do a restatement of the ideal nature of graduate work would be appropriate. The Ph.D. degree in the United States has been historically regarded as a research degree and the Ph.D. program has been seen as involving specific course requirements, a series of examinations, and a thesis, which should ideally be an original contribution to knowledge. The Ph.D program requires sophisticated and high level conceptual learning and a reasonable mastery of a complex field of study. It should be pursued through intensive work, carried out under the direct supervision of faculty recognized as authoritative in relevant fields of study. It should culminate in a complex, scholarly project done under the guidance and supervision of a faculty member who has demonstrated the ability to direct such projects, since only an experienced scholar should be allowed to guide a Ph.D. thesis. A number of concepts should be explicitly included in a Ph.D. program. There should be intense concentration over an extended period of time (a normal range of between 2-4 years beyond the masters degree or between 3-5 years beyond the bachelors degree) in the program's broad subject domain, so that there will be time for mastery and maturing of understanding. A course of study should be pursued under the appropriate guidance of qualified scholars in order to encourage the development and testing of understanding, another quality so necessary to the maturing of a scholar. Further, the course of study should be conducted in such a way that relationships between different fields of knowledge can be perceived. This is best done in a community of scholars found in a university or a group of associated colleges. Cross-field committee members and cross-field requirements should be used to help candidates avoid excessively specialized or concentrated programs. Institutions should not undertake offering the Ph.D. without extensive and relevant library holdings, laboratory facilities and, where appropriate, clinical or service situations. While there can be many different kinds of theses, ranging from large surveys to historical works to sophisticated essays, the hallmarks of all Ph.D. theses should be depth of understanding of a major field, sophistication of concept and illumination of the essential nature of a field of knowledge.

When a doctorate is appropriate for an applied field (and the number of such fields should probably be quite restricted) the doctorate is different from the Ph.D., although it should also reflect sophisticated performance and understanding. Such doctorates are designed to prepare people for specific professional and high level vocational roles and as such should stress skill of performance. Programs should stress the reciprocal relationships between theory and experimentation in the relevant arts or sciences and should involve actual profesional practice. The well-designed M.D. degree is perhaps the best example of this kind of relationship. Approximately half of the curriculum is concerned with the sciences basic to medicine and half involves clinical practice. Thus several kinds of people should teach in applied doctoral programs. Some professors should be recognized masters of the craft. A program which unduly emphasizes one aspect over the other should be suspect, as should also a program relying excessively on work experience that is unsupervised and not carefully evaluated, no matter how closely related it is to the role for which a student is being prepared. Since the applied doctorate is intended to develop a high level skill in the performance of complicated tasks, the program must be pursued over a considerable length of time in order to facilitate proper synthesis of theory and practice. Ideally the program should be relatively intense and not extended piecemeal over long periods of time. In addition, professional preparation is for the most part not something which can be accomplished by a student in isolation--it requires close interaction between students and mentors and among students. It also requires considerable independent work. Independent work without review or work only lightly supervised is not likely, however, to develop high levels of competence. The acquisition of complex skills requires continuous evaluation and this in turn requires the sustained presence of people qualified to judge that work.

An obvious implication of such a conceptualization of doctoral programs is that properly conducted such programs are terribly expensive. To provide the close guidance for doctoral research or the close supervision of field practice would require a very small student-faculty ratio. Probably admission into well established doctoral programs should not exceed an average of 1 to 1½ first year doctoral students per year per full-time faculty member, and this may even be too high. This would yield a normal advising load of between 5 and 6 students for each full-time faculty member and should produce the granting of perhaps one doctoral degree per year per full-time faculty member.

A more parsimonious set of university purposes and close adherence to the ideal of doctoral study should produce sharp decreases in programs and in doctoral enrollments. Programs not essentially intellectual would be judged inappropriate for a university and people interested in the experience of transcendental meditation or multicultural living experiences would seek elsewhere to satisfy their desires. Similarly, people wanting their work experiences to be recognized would also look elsewhere.

Finer distinctions regarding various masters degrees also seem to be desirable. As a general principle the nomenclature of masters degrees should clearly indicate the nature of work taken and the competencies which possession of the degrees imply. There are currently two types of masters degrees of arts and sciences. One type should presume the possession of a bachelors degree and should be considered as essentially an extension of bachelors level work indicating a deepening and maturing of knowledge but not a specific focus on research or vocational competency. As an extension of bachelors level work these masters programs can be developed and courses taught by professors competent to teach advanced undergraduate courses and with no presumption of their possessing specific research competencies. A separate type of masters of arts or masters of science is closer to the traditional conception of that degree. Some institutions conceive of the masteres degree of arts and sciences as research oriented and closely related to the doctoral level work. This is perfectly proper. These institutions must, however, be willing to have their programs judged by appropriate criteria. Thus research-oriented programs would be judged by criteria appropriate to doctoral level work and these would include the research qualifications and experience of faculty. As a general principle a program leading to a masters degree in arts and sciences should require approximately a year of academic work for those possessing a bachelors degree with specific and measured competence in the fields of the masters. For students entering a masters program substantially different from that of their bachelors preparation, longer periods of time would seem to be necessary. The first type of masters degree program should be taught or directed by individuals judged at least competent to teach advanced undergraduate courses and to direct undergraduate concentrations or subconcentrations. Faculty should typically possess a doctorate or equivalent and should be able to provide evidence of continuing scholarly activity in their field. Faculty directing research-oriented masters programs in arts and sciences should in any case have demonstrated research competencies and experience in directing graduate research undertakings.

The masters degree in a professional field is different. Ideally the name of the degree should indicate the appropriate professional field. For example, Master of Engineering, Master of Social Work, Master of Education or Master of Arts in Teaching. These degrees are designed to develop specific skills and abilities needed to practice a vocation or profession; hence, the requirements should be specifically related to a consistent vision of desired practice. Courses taught and activities supervised should be the direct responsibility of a faculty which has recognized knowledge of both theory underlying practice and practice itself. Complex skills needed in vocations for which a masters degree seems warranted require consistent, sustained effort to develop; hence, programs leading to a masters degree should be concentrated with respect to time and focus and the relevance of what is taught for the actual skills needed. Two extremes should be avoided: programs concentrated over too short a period of time, as for example, a few months, and programs which allow academic credit to be earned in small amounts over excessively long periods of time, as for example, seven or eight years. Depending on the specific profession, masters degrees may involve one or two full academic years if deficiencies in undergraduate preparation must be made up. These degrees may also involve definite experiences with practice; in this case, the practice should be under the direct and appropriate supervision of qualified individuals, i.e., ones who meet generally recognized standards of professional performance in the field, or, in the case of emerging professions in related fields. The supervision of professional performance is a time consuming activity. Field supervisors or clinical professors should have a reasonable number of students to supervise at any one time to insure availability of faculty, especially if a supervisor is in active practice outside the institution.

The argument advanced is plausible because it does not address the substantive matter of what is and is not appropriate for graduate education, especially at the doctoral level. Yet such an issue must be faced. It will be argued here that for a subject or field to be appropriate for doctoral study it must possess at least a majority of the attributes of a discipline which will include at least a bow to moderate technology and important theoretical components.

The concept of a discipline probably is one of the most overworked and ill-defined terms bandied about in the academy. One commonly accepted criteria in a discipline is a general body of knowledge which can at least be forced into some reasonably logical taxonomy so that scholars can tell, at least quantitatively, where gaps in accepted knowledge exist. The corollary is that a discipline should possess both a specialized vocabulary and a generally accepted basic literature which at least outlines its parameters. Moreover, a discipline commonly involves some generally accepted body of theory and some generally understood techniques for theory testing and revision. One other essential of a discipline is a generally accepted body of consistently applied techniques of analysis or a generally agreed upon methodology. The literature of relatively precise disciplines, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry and, increasingly, experimental psychology, is almost stylized, so well understood are their analytical tools. Related to and perhaps inseparable from these criteria is that of recognized techniques for replication and revalidation of research and scholarship. As scholarly fields mature and gain acceptance they acquire trappings which symbolize their status as disciplines--scholarly associations restricted to those with at least rudimentary competence in the field; journals using referees to screen materials submitted for publication for evidence of competent scholarship; mutual recognition of more and less competent scholars, with those judged the more able regularly called upon to judge the others. Most disciplines have a recognized sequence of experiences for the preparation of scholars and research workers. A mature discipline occupies a recognized place in relation to other disciplines and has clearly conceivable linkages to them. Another criterion is difficult to apply, yet of some significance: From a disciplinary standpoint research is frequently dichotomized as basic or applied and scholars in a mature discipline devote considerable energy to solving basic or theoretical questions. Of all criteria of a discipline, possibly the key is a sense of sequence which enables scholars to predict where they should look next. The simplest example is, of course, the periodic table which enabled chemists to know what new elements should be sought.

In a sense derivative from this concept of a discipline is the concept of high and low technology. Some fields, notably the hard sciences, but by no means exclusively those, require high levels of competency in manipulating a sophisticated technology. This may be the technology of the microscope, of dating prehistoric artifacts, or the construction and utilization of psychological tests. In other fields, even full professional practice does not require technological competence other than the use of traits or attributes developed from childhood on. Teaching, some kinds of student personnel work, some kinds of social work or even some kinds of counseling, seem more to require openness, empathy, verbal facility, sympathy, habits of organization, and honesty--all developed as individuals grow up and mature--rather than competency to employ a specific technology, as, for example, surgical procedures or materials testing devices.

The third concept is that of consistently sequential theory. There are some fields in which the testing of one set of theories predicts the direction the next theoretical advance will take and that direction can be known by any sophisticate in the field. In these fields each generation builds logically on the work of the preceding generation. At the other end of the continuum are those fields in which, if there are theories, they are discrete, testing neither on what has come before nor predictive as to what is to come later. Molecular biology might illustrate the former and applied journalism the latter.

Without urging at this point any precise formula, it can be argued that for a field to warrant doctoral level work it should possess many of the characteristics of a discipline, should involve at least moderate technology and should involve to some degree at least consistently sequential theory. Using these three one could raise questions as to whether or not journalism, women's study, bicultural education, or religion would be appropriate doctoral fields of study.

If the university attempts to do only those few things it can do exceptionally well, and if subjects considered for graduate education are carefully scrutinized as to their appropriateness, if the nomenclature of degrees clearly indicates the substance of the program and the competencies of graduates and if programs are conducted with some fidelity with the ideals of graduate education, several things will happen. There will be a reduction in the amount of graduate education, but improvement in quality. The marketplace will know more precisely what is available and will draw on the graduate schools for only a portion of the manpower needed, but that portion will be utilized much more effectively to the satisfaction of the individual and the effectiveness of the market.

Chapter XII

Toward Quality

Literature concerning the purposes of higher education can be classified as utopian, bibliographic, technological, or unfocussed. The utopian sets abstract goals which very likely transcend the potency of any social institution. The bibliographic presents, for the most part, reverential citations of Whitehead and lesser educational deities. The technological calls for a restoration of purpose, but then never gets around to stating what those purposes are but does discuss organization and administration. The unfocussed essentially calls upon educational institutions to do whatever good people seem to want to have done. The flavor of the idealistic is expressed by Schuster claiming that education is ". . . awareness of the vital activity of the receptive, creative mind face to face with reality in the whole of its illusory overtness and its revealing concealment" (Schuster, 1960, p. 123). A similar idealistic goal which really does not help inform and direct is Kirk's claim that the aim of college education ". . . was ethical, the development of moral understanding and humane leadership," and that it was intended to produce ". . . a sprinkling of men and women who know what it is to be truly human, who have some taste for contemplation, who take the long views, and who have a sense of moral responsibility and intellectual order" (Kirk, 1965, pp. 52-53). Similarly, Walton claimed that liberal education ". . . must be concenred with the architecture of the human soul. It should provide students not with the right answers, but with the right questions, and those questions concern three matters, basically: God, love, and death" (Walton, 1979, p. 190).

Bibliographic theorists are probably the most prolific and are well illustrated by Murray asserting , "What the humanist is supposed to have in mind, needing utterance, is, in the end, a view of reality in Newman's sense of the word view. In The Idea of the University, he contrasts the genuine philosophical habit of mind, which is at once the possession and the quest for a view, with that spurious philosophism which shows itself in what, for want of a word, I may call 'viewness'" (Cohen, 1964, p. 236). That differs from the technological argument expressed by Bolman, who argued, ". . . the idea of what constituted higher education was common to all the systems. It was that education at this level had to be based on specialized science and scholarship, and that it had to be linked to research, at least to the extent that professors were expected to be qualified and successful researchers. . . . In principle, all the reformed systems of higher education were perfectly meritocratic and pragmatic" (Bolman, 1979, p. 3).

Then there is the newer concept especially expressed by a variety of the radical reformers, with its essence well caught by Gollattscheck and others claiming, "From a philosophical perspective, the community renewal college recognizes that education should be everywhere--rather than separate from the community. The only requirement of the setting is that the community be able to work and learn there. Community renewal education becomes a reality only when the community and the institution join together to decide upon such things as educational needs within the community. Such a philosophical perspective suggests that the college must be more than a formal institution with a defined campus and structured programs. The community and the college can no longer be side by side; they must instead be intermingled. The essence of serving individual and community needs can be found in the college's commitment to overcome the countless physical, psychological and other barriers that keep students in the community from attending on-campus programs" (Gollattscheck and other, 1976, pp. 135-136).

Before proceeding with this summing up, several prefatory remarks are made to establish a context of belief. The first is to applaud and support one of the unique differences between higher education in the United States and that found in most of the other developed, industrial democracies. That is, the rather broad conception of higher education, which could subsume undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences, graduate education, and, as need arose, a wide variety of professional education, which added to the older professions of theology, medicine, and law the new ones of engineering, business, education, home economics, agriculture, forestry, social work, journalism, and public policy. Just by linking all of these under a central rubric, the American system was made highly flexible, allowing students to shift without appreciable loss of time from the study of one profession to another. When those professional fields were taken out of the pale of higher education, a student enrolling in professional education could never subsequently shift and pursue, say, a doctoral program in English literature. This flexibility and interchangeability of educational preparation was in large measure made possible by the self-discipline in the various professional programs in maintaining reasonable balance between theoretical and applied work and reasonable adherence to canons of scholarship and rigor. Agriculture, home economics, and library science were accepted into American universities because they did not depart radically from the disciplinary orientations of faculties in the arts and sciences. The danger which emerged during the 1970s and 1980s was that that openness and flexibility came to be exploited by the argument that if preparation for social work was an appropriate higher educational activity, why not also include preparation for any other conceivable vocation? If instruction in the practice of forestry were worthy of academic recognition, why not the practice of any other skill? Regardless of where or how obtained, perhaps the essential task of higher education in the United States is to develop an accepted rationale which allows and encourages an openness and flexibility, but which, at the same time, clearly delineates those things which should not be considered as higher education. It is proper that American institutions of higher education allow more than undergraduate and graduate training in arts and sciences and the historic professional training in theology, medicine, and law. It is not proper, however, that the system is infinitely adaptable to accommodate an infinite range of new activities.

A second observation is the need to think in terms of essentials. What, for example, is the least that the college professor should do in good conscience to warrant his or her salary? What is the least the college or university should do in good conscience to warrant continued public support? It can be argued that if that least purpose is done well, the end of quality is likely to be achieved. Concentrating on essentials should produce an awareness as to what an educational institution can do well and what things are better left to some other institution. Where institutionalized higher education has produced trouble for itself in the past and likely will do so in the future is by attempting to do things it is incapable of performing. One of the parts of general education programs during the 1950s were courses explicitly designed to produce better personal adjustment and effective living. The idea was that a formal course could help students solve deeply imbedded personal problems and move into a more tranquil life-style. The mistake of such courses was epitomized by the undergraduate student saying in such a course that he or she would be dammed if personal problems were going to become the content of an academic course. It is also epitomized by the graduate of Columbia College who sued the institution which had claimed to develop wisdom and the student recognized full well that he was not wise. While the student protests of the late 1960s had multiple causes, there is good reason to believe that one underlying cause was the fact that higher education promised, in one way or another, a great deal more than it had the capacity to accomplish. Student disappointment converted to rage. A quite plausible anticipated outcome of educators' claims to produce community renewal, education for each, and the immediate satisfaction of whatever need anyone develops, would be individual and public reaction when such claims were not validated. There is some reason to believe that a slow-down in college enrollment began when many college-age youth sensed that collegiate education could not produce the economic gains which were implied as an important outcome.

The central argument of this book can be quickly summarized. It is argued that the concept of academic quality as produced by formal educational process is an old concept, equally valid in the twentieth century as in the twelfth century. Further, it is argued that the processes by which academic quality is best achieved have also a long history and continued validity and vitality. The medieval university concentrated on cultivating the intellect of students through pondering and expanding intellectual tradition by means of student and professor, student and student, and professor and professor, all in the expectation that cultivated intelligence was needed by the growing bureaucracies of Church and evolving nation-states. The American colonial college had a similar mission, and performed it in a similar way. Until approximately 1970, there appeared to be essential agreement in twentieth century colleges and universities as to their central mission and purpose.

The traditional concept of the essential purpose of college or university education came under serious attack, beginning about 1970, through a substantial wave of anti-intellectualism advanced under the banner of egalitarianism. That anti-intellectualism included rejecting the intellect as the primary, or even one of the primary, concerns of formal education; rejecting the idea that the highly-trained professional was best suited to offer collegiate education, rejecting the centrality of words, numbers, and abstract concepts as the essential substance of higher education, rejecting intellectual performance as a basis for credentialing, and rejecting traditional forms of education as being irrelevant to a radically changed and radically changing society. This anti-intellectualism was expressed by a growing number of critics and theorists and practiced (frequently because of financial considerations) by a growing number of institutions. Anti-intellectualism, of course, was nothing new to American society, but the wholesale embracing of an anti-intellectual doctrine on the part of professional educators was new. Whether the anti-intellectual doctrine spreads and becomes incorporated into the mainstream of American higher education remains undetermined.

Anti-intellectualism is especially revealed in the many reforms which were suggested after the decline of the general education movement and the end to high selectivity of students for entry into higher education. These reforms included modifying and weakening grading standards; equating life experience with academic preparation; reducing foreign language, English and mathematics requirements; offering academic credit for sub-collegiate level courses; and creating whatever kinds of courses for which there seemed to be a reasonable demand someplace. By 1980, however, the pendulum had begun to swing away from such reforms, especially in the highly selective prestigious institutions. While there appeared no agreement as to whether an undergraduate curriculum should best be free elective, distributed, or prescribed, nonetheless, the counter-reform initiative sought to restore academic or intellectual quality and integrity.

When institutions began to grow in size and enrollment, particularly after World War II, institutions began to provide a range of student services, including housing, counseling and guidance, health services, remedial services, and a wide range of activities, athletic events, and cultural and intellectual events. The primary motivation was to assist students in overcoming barriers to successful academic performance, and to improve the texture and quality of campus life. That first surge of expanding student services slowed considerably during the late 1960s, as students demanded and gained greater control over their own lives. However, as part of the anti-intellectual movement, new or more intensive services were urged, including childcare centers, long-term remedial services for which academic credit was to be given, making major efforts to help students develop skills of inter-personal relationships, and facilitating the delivery of whatever kinds of educationally-related services anyone wanted at whatever period of their lives and in whatever location was most convenient to students. If there is to come about a restoration and maintaining of academic quality, some services seem to be appropriate and manageable; however, the number and variety of services should very likely be curtailed. Academic and careers advising, limited amounts of remedial service, better orientation to academic life, and a reasonable amount and variety of cultural and intellectual events would appear to be optimal.

Faculty members are rather unique people, for the most part, rather elaborately prepared to understand in depth a particular subject. While individuals may vary considerably in how they communicate and deal with that subject to students, nonetheless, that is what faculty members are expected to do.

However, much of the reforming literature seems to ask that in addition to knowing a subject, professors should be psychologists, therapists, educational programmers, and capable of facilitating development of a wide range of human feeling and emotion. Such advice is probably unrealistic, will not be accepted by the majority of professors, and probably is educationally wrong. Professors should be accepted for being what they are, which involves being fallibly human, with a few definite professional skills and abilities, and varying degrees of mature or immature sensitivity, insight, and judgment. Unless the entire preparation of college teachers is changed (a phenomenon not likely to transpire) the roles and activities of professors in the future are not likely to be significantly different from what they have been in the past, and that is probably wise.

The quality of college teaching has been continuously criticized for almost a century , with very little detectable change. Essentially, college teaching consists of transmitting information, interpreting it, analyzing it, and determining whether or not students have acquired information, understand it, and can apply it reasonably well to new situations. Literally hundreds of suggestions have been made for the improvement of college teaching. Some call for new administrative arrangements, as, for example, changing the reward system to emphasize teaching. Suggestions call for adoption of new psychological theories and new professorial roles, and using educational technology as a kind of twentieth-century wonder-drug. Then there are a cluster of common-sense suggestions which would include such things as how to deliver lectures more effectively, how to make better selections of texts, and how to grade students more reliably. If instructional quality is to be maintained, professors should not be expected to embrace radically new techniques of teaching, but, rather, might be encouraged in a low key to improve those techniques whose validity has in part been validated by their perseveration.

Increasingly, for most purposes of insuring sheer institutional survival and for the purposes of maintaining academic quality, a strong centralized-decentralized system of administration and governance seems wise. A strong central administration is needed to facilitate setting of institutional goals, and, through having ultimate authority over every part of an institution, can make those critical decisions upon which institutional destiny rests. Thus, the central administrative role is crucial in: budget preparation; faculty-personnel policies; final decisions regarding faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure; and establishing and maintaining long-range plans. However, those decisions most intimately associated with academic quality properly should be the responsibility of subordinate academic administrative units--mainly departments, in larger institutions, and divisions, in smaller ones not capable of sustaining reasonably-sized departments. It is in the department that courses and curriculum development takes place. It is in the department that the needs for particular kinds of professors are established. It is in departments that advising will most likely take place. It should be departments which control the budgets appropriated to them to conduct departmental programs.

Two complex organizations have emerged during the 1960s and 1970s as self-proclaimed insurers of quality. One of these is the cluster of supra-institutional coordinating counsels, state-wide boards of control, and trustees boards for systems of institutions. These originally were created in most states as a way of insuring orderly expansion of state-wide higher education systems. However, as they developed and produced expanding bureaucracies (frequently looking for something to do), they began to assume responsibility for such qualitative matters as review of academic programs, final approval of appointments of faculty members and administrative officers on individual campuses. A parallel development took place in the associations for regional accreditation. Regional accrediting associations were, for the most part, products of turn-of-the-century educational thinking and were created to monitor the quality of secondary schools and, eventually, to insure comparability of quality among the various colleges and universities. Using relatively formal accumulations of quantitative information, the associations set and established quite minimal but reasonable desired standards with respect to faculty qualififcations, library holdings, and other such matters. However, during the generally expansionist period of the 1960s, regional accreditation arrogated to itself the additional responsibilities of stimulating innovation and producing qualitative changes in institutions.

Neither of these organizations have appeared to affect quality positively; they may even have affected quality negatively. Nor is there good reason to expect supra-campus agencies really to affect quality. Academic and intellectual quality is associated with the many small constituencies comprising a college or university campus. What they do really seems immune to the exhortations of the various educational bureaucracies. The whole qualitative issue is captured in the statement of one official in a prestige institution regarding accreditation: "I got into the accreditation effort with some misgivings and emerged from it with a good deal of dissatisfaction. My misgivings were based on my expectation that we were going to go through a great deal of time and effort for what would amount to be an empty ritual. Once I became engaged in the process, I began to feel more positively about the exercise, since, as usual, it is not possible to engage in any protracted collaboration with other colleagues without learning something from it. . . I would have to say that to the extent that the accreditation process prompted the self-study it served a useful function, but I fear that its usefulness stopped there, and what is worse, the recommendations of the accreditation team, if taken seriously, would positively harm our efforts to improve matters" (Personal letter from an anonymous colleague).

The proof of an institution's concern with academic and intellectual quality ultimately can probably best be guaged by the qualities of the individuals graduated. Indeed, establishing the desires and qualities of graduates is possibly one of the best approaches to academic planning. Desired qualities, to be effective, however, should be realistic and well within the ability of a collegiate institution to influence them. Obviously, they should be well within the limits of a human being to achieve them in the time allocated.

First of all, there are a number of desirable qualities of an educated individual which are very likely impossible of achievement and therefore should not figure in institutional planning or effort. The first of these is fluency in one or more foreign languages. It can be quickly established that citizens of the United States are much less proficient with foreign languages than would be desirable for any of a variety of national purposes. It can also be established that facility in the use of foreign languages quickly makes available to individuals rich new cultural resources. It is also conceivable that facility with foreign languages, thereby opening up new cultures, could produce some greater tolerance for civilizations other than the American civilization. However, that goal can never be achieved for any but a tiny proportion of the population for several different reasons. First of all, the sheer size and self-containment of the United States is such that most of its citizens lack the imperative of becoming proficient in a foreign tongue, such as would be present, for example, in Luxembourg. Probably in response to that lack of imperative is the fact that foreign language requirements in secondary schools and colleges have been far less than what would be essential to develop true linguistic facility. Thus, during the 1930s and 1940s, a time of much more stringent requirements than the 1970s, typical requirements would be two years of a language in high school and two years of a language, typically not the same, in college. Neither two years' exposure developed sufficient linguistic insight to insure retention and even expansion of facility in reading, speaking, or writing. From that time onward, requirements were reduced steadily, so that secondary school requirements were virtually eliminated, and collegiate requirements decreased first from two years to one and then eliminated. By the 1980s, some few institutions attempted to reestablish a requirement, but still only at a level likely to produce superficiality. If genuine foreign language facility were to become essential throughout the United States, optimum requirements would probably be four years of secondary school language, followed by four years of collegiate exposure to the same language. Departure from that intensity in any significant way would seriously erode the quality of linguistic proficiency produced. Since such a load will likely never be proposed, linguistic facility as an essential trait of an educated person in the United States should probably be rejected on pragmatic grounds.

A second, possibly desirable, but unrealistic expectation of an educated individual is the implied expectation that college graduates should participate actively in most manifestations of high culture, that they should reflect a deep and sophisticated understanding of events taking place both in the United States and in other nations, and that they should know the details of United States history and, at least, the broad outlines of histories of all other parts of the world. Thus, critics of American life-style and of education, even highly responsible critics, express profound disquiet about serious deficiencies. Not enough people, especially not enough college graduates, regularly read serious novels, attend serious musical events, or actively acquire and enjoy significant art. Too few adults are able to recall the details of the Bill of Rights, and too few individuals are aware of the political organization of even the major industrial democracies, and too few Americans even know, much less appreciate, the variety of rich cultural experiences extant in the United States, such as the Black, Oriental, or Native American traditions. It is noted critically that college graduates, as well as non-college graduates, spend too much time watching television, and that the philistine charge, for much of American civilization, is far too easily supported. Now, the desirability of high culture, of knowledge of many civilizations, of understanding of the daily flow of events is as desirable as foreign language facility. However, expecting perfection and bemoaning deviation from an ideal overlooks the many conditions in American life which mitigate against achieving that ideal. Probably the major reason for the lack of realism of the high cultural ideal is the essential nature of the American experience and the resultant civilization. As Lerner remarks, "America possesses an educational system which, for all its deficiencies, provides a constant stream of new human abilities for decision making in industry and government. It has spread its national income widely enough to hold the allegience of its people, even in times of the most dangerous inner and world crises. It possesses a popular vigor that shows itself in the American speech, jazz, movies, and other popular arts, and offers proof that the fires of cultural strength still burn intensely. It has opened up to most of the people accessions of new experience in the big media, yet it retains a gusto for living and an earthiness of taste and style which are far from being the signs of a decadent of effeminate people. It renews its strength from institutions of freedom embedded within the family system and the prevailing religious traditions, as well as within the economy. It has shown a resiliance in bearing the shocks of war and depression, and a strength of fiber in meeting the challenges of both tyrannies and new barbarians. Finally, it evinces an inveterate optimism which restricts the prophesies of doom to small groups of moralists and intellectuals, whose experience scarcely touches the experience of the rest of the people" (Lerner, 1957, p. 936).

This is not to reject some validity to such traits as reflecting quality, but it is to reject struggling for an impossible ideal.

In a related vein, it is frequently argued that a deep understanding of the nature of science is an imperative of all educated individuals, not only because of the values of science as science, but because science plays such a significant role in ordering life. The contention is that the understanding of science can only come from exposure to actual science, including sophisticated use of mathematics. This ideal is reflected in collegiate curricular discussion, in which scientists criticize courses about science, or even courses in the history of science, on the ground that only direct exposure to physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics can produce the level of understanding and sophistication desired. Ideally, there might be much to commend in exposing all students to real science in the major scientific fields, however, to achieve such a goal would very likely require four years of high school mathematics and at least two additional years of college mathematics. Given the role and condition of American secondary education, such an ideal is not likely to be realized, as was the case of foreign language. Rather than posit an ideal which cannot be achieved, the ideal should be dropped in favor of more pragmatic goals.

In addition to ideal characteristics of an educated individual impossible to attain, there are a number of quite desirable human traits and attributes which either should not be the responsibility of colleges and universities, or which are likely to be so highly developed by the time individuals reach college that there are not readily available sufficiently potent ways of seriously modifying them. These latter would include such traits as honesty, a sense of justice, fundamental ethical principles, and even individual attitudes toward the dignity of human beings. It should be noted in this connection that such underlying values frequently are susceptible to modification if sufficiently precise and intensive interventions are used. It is possible, for example, to modify such a deeply embedded personality trait as authoritarianism. However, the needed therapeutic intervention requires considerable clinical competency--a competency not likely to be possessed by college professors. During the period 1940-1980, concern has been expressed periodically that collegiate institutions should assume responsibility for values. However, the interest wanes when the complexity is realized of the needed technology. The complexity of serious efforts to modify fundamental values is illustrated by Richard L. Morrill, Teaching Values in College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), a quick reading of which should reveal that expecting college professors to make such an effort would distort them from doing what they are really prepared to do.

Similarly, there is likely very little that colleges and universities can or should do for substantial numbers of students with respect to marital adjustment, personal cleanliness, personal habits and personal adjustment, political affiliation, style of parenting, and, except in the clearly religious institution, religious belief and affiliation. Granted that the range of human talent, skills, and ability is enormous, it is argued that most of them are beyond the reasonable competency of collegiate institutions. These would include good mental health, most mechanical abilities (except those which emerge informally from the variety of situations existing on a campus), or survival skills specifically needed to cope with criminal behavior on the streets. If a collegiate institution deliberately chooses to become concerned with some one or several of such matters and is willing to find and finance the needed professional expertise which will deal with a limited number of students, there can be no serious objection, since collegiate institutions quite properly are given wide latitude with respect to what they do. To suggest, however, that collegiate institutions generally should be responsible for such matters throughout their student bodies is to ask the impossible.

There are a limited number of traits which should be the responsibility of undergraduate education in all collegiate institutions, with which collegiate faculties are competent to deal. Success in producing these outcomes would comprise what is conceived of as being academic quality throughout this book. The first and, by all odds, the most important is the development of a reasonable facility in the use of the English language at a reasonably sophisticated level. In many respects, the essence of undergraduate education is literary, that is, learning through the use of various kinds of literature to cope with various complexities in life. This is a trait which legitimately can be sought in almost all college-level courses and lies within the clear competency of the professoriat. This ability is the route to several other legitimate outcomes of undergraduate education. One of these is the acquisition of a reasonable and growing store of knowledge about a variety of reasonably complicated subjects. After language facility, probably the most important thing colleges and universities do is to transmit to students considerable knowledge, along with understanding of that knowledge and some ability to apply that knowledge in new situations. The more knowledge colleges supplied to students, the more knowledge they will be able to recall and to use, even granting that there will be considerable forgetting. There is considerable nonsense suggested in this connection; one cliche, for example, says that the collegiate institution should not be concerned with student acquisition of knowledge, but rather, the skills needed to acquire knowledge when needed. The fatuousness of such a claim can be illustrated by observing that the highest level of acquiring knowledge is research and scholarship, the first step of which is the individual having been steeped in knowledge of whatever the subject is. It is from deep awareness of that knowledge that the proper questions for proper inquiry derive.

It is also from facility with the English language that come the most essential skills and competencies needed, in Milton's language, for all the offices of peace and war. These would include ability to read or hear instructions, to give instructions, to transmit clearly reasonably complicated information, to obtain information upon which various sorts of evaluation can be made, and to organize and re-organize information in search of alternative beliefs about reality.

It is also through language that the various acts of citizenship are learned and practiced. The practice of informing oneself about social issues, analysis of social events, discussion of political matters, and preparing to vote on the basis of knowledge, are all literary facts, facility in which can best be developed through intensive reading, writing, and talking over a period of years.

To advance an extreme formulation, a strong case can be made that for all college students of whatever age or whatever background, most of the essential value of collegiate education could be obtained from well-prepared informationally enriched courses in literature, writing and speaking, history, and other courses dealing with non-trivial, substantive matters. Many theoretical arguments can be raised against this stark outline. Those who contend that there are hemispheric differences in the brains of various individuals will likely contend that the literary premise favors one cerebral organization over another. Those who discuss various cognitive styles will similarly say that the literary premise favors one style over others. There are many who will argue that the life experiences and educational backgrounds of man, especially some of the newer students, could not cope with so much language. The only response is that the argument is here advanced with respect to essentials needed by all people, regardless of what their subsequent life-style, vocation, or calling will be. Clearly, people will differ with respect to verbal facility, but all require some degree of verbal sophistication to cope with the kind of life twentieth-century United States provides.

A perplexing issue arises with respect to the other major intellectual power of quantitative use of numbers and other abstract symbols. In a society dominated by science and technology and likely to be symbolized in the future by computers, the need for quantitative ability is obvious. The question is, what skills are most needed for everyone, and how can they be developed. A glib recommendation would be to urge that all students should have four years of secondary school mathematics followed by more mathematics in college, including developing reasonable statistical and computer capabilities.

407

Unfortunately, such a recommendation runs counter to rather deep-seated fears and antagonism regarding numbers, which exists in the total society. What is probably required is for institutions gradually to increase the quantitative requirements and, at the same time, work with secondary education so that over time greater quantitative sophistication on the part of high school graduates can evolve. That same gradualism would seem to be needed with respect to science.

In an ideal future, one might hope that equal stress could be placed on language facility, quantitative facility, and facility with use of abstract concepts, but as of 1982 verbal language remains the most improtant for all people. Individuals can survive reasonably and can function quite effectively in American society without ability to do much more than balance a checkbook and prepare an income tax form in the quantitative domain. They simply cannot function effectively without verbal language.

Several other desirable attributes can be quickly summarized as being important objectives of collegiate education which are within the capabilities of collegiate faculties and other educational instrumentalities. One would be a reasonable understanding of, and ability to cope with, complex bureaucracies through which contemporary society is organized. Second, would be a reasonable sense of the main elements of American society and ways in which it differs from other societies. The third would be a reasonable sense of self and a reasonable degree of self acceptance. These can all be explicitly provided for through the selection of specific literatures.

A matter which appears also to be of importance but has not yet achieved a well accepted place is aestethic development as revealed in the fine and peforming arts. Harold Taylor reflected a reality in the late 1960s, which appears still to be true. "So recent is the concern of the society for the arts as an element in the popular culture and so recent and sudden is the expansion of the potential and actual audience for the arts that the educational system is not ready either for the artists or their audiences. On the contrary, the educational system has done its best to keep the arts and their practitioners outside and to eliminate systematically from admissions, all those whose talents are in the arts, in favor of students who were adept in the scholastic exercises. In the elementary schools, only 10 percent of all teaching in the visual arts is done by persons who have had any experience in the field (Taylor, 1966). Before that condition will change and before aesthetic matters will assume curricular parity with language and number there must be a massive demonstration in the entire society that the fine and performing arts are truly central in the lives of people, or could be if allowed to become.

The underlying premise of this book has been that there has been an overall erosion of academic quality in higher education in the United States, especially in the late 1960s onward. In the several chapters, suggestions have been advanced as to how that erosion might be stopped and academic and intellectual quality restored and maintained. Out of all of that discussion comes some overarching considerations which could direct public educational policy and could provide criteria for individual institutional action.

The first and perhaps most important matter is that the doctrine of ever expanding service to ever expanding clientele is the aim of higher education, should be examined dispassionately from various points of view and if found wanting attacked, discredited and ultimately defeated. Neither social, political, economic nor technological needs would appear to be well served by publicly supported programs under the banner of education, which simply satisfy personal aspiration of the elderly for a college degree, which provide training in arts and crafts for middle-aged adults, which seek to orchestrate the providing of whatever kinds of information individuals want at whatever times in their lives, or which attempt to provide through educational institutions, personal support for individuals facing the variety of crises which are the lot of humankind. The effort on the part of some theorists to provide justification for infinite services and the attempts of some institutions to provide them, are in many respects responsible for serious decline in academic quality. The syllogism has a patently fraudulent character. It essentially states that high quality medical care is a major social value which requires highly educated and prepared medical practitioners. Senior citizens would enjoy retirement more if there were available a variety of easily accessible recreational, cultural, and intellectual activities. Since both medical care and the quality of life of retirees are both socially good, therefore, public funds should be used to finanacially support each activity to whatever extent is necessary, even at a time when the finances needed for the subsistance of the chronically poor and disadvantaged has been seriously questioned. If the argument cannot be supported that every individual is entitled to whaever kind of educationally-related service is desired, then some limits ought to be placed, if necessary through political means, but ideally through educational and intellectual debate. The issue ultimately comes down to this: given finite resources, should they go to the intellectual preparation of the young, or for some degree of personal and emotional satisfaction of the elderly. The issue is clearly joined by the description of an ideal center "like the modern shopping center" is customer-oriented. It has an open door, and all programs and activities are highly visible. Open seven days a week from early morning to late at night, it delivers the educational services that people want and need. Students may enter at any time, leave when they have completed their objectives, and reenter when they feel they need more education. How pay for that range of services? "Perhaps the most obvious and widespread is the use of federal funds, since many federal programs are aimed at improving the lot of an individual constituency within the community, solving community problems, testing experimental programs, or some combination of these goals, they relate directly to the work of the community renewal college. The college with creative management and many ties to the community will find it possible to take advantage of not only those federal programs directly related to education but also those aimed at community improvement generally and only indirectly related to education.

If every suggestion for significant extension of service were forced to compare the values and costs of each service with other major social imperatives, perhaps the expansionist tendency might be muted.

Another transcendent policy matter is the necessity for a restoration of academic and intellectual quality to secondary education. There can be little question as to the qualitative decline in secondary education during the 1960s and 1970s. There is the earlier cited decline in academic aptitude test scores, there is the crescendoing testimony as to overall decline in literacy on the part of high school graduates, and there is also the documented decline in the percentage of high school students taking intellectually demanding academic courses. It could be observed that during the 1960s there were serious attempts to revise secondary curriculum in mathematics, physical science, biological science, and English in the direction of facilitating greater student understanding of those fields. However, those reforms for the most part did not succeed, in part because they attempted an extreme reformulation of those subjects, in part because teachers were unprepared to use a new nomenclature and in part because they (like so many of the subsequent collegiate reform efforts) were overly complex and required skills on the part of teachers not realistically reasonable to expect. The effect of those declines seems to have been significant drops in enrollments in those subjects.

Coupled with those curricula failures has come a decline in the quality of secondary school teaching. Atkin observed that "those who sought teaching positions in the 1930s and 1940s included significant numbers of academically able people . . . things are different now. In the first place, today's entering college freshman is less likely to aim toward a career in teaching than college freshmen at any time during the last thirty years. Furthermore, the intellectual ability of those who do intend to teach, as measured by standardized tests, is markedly lower than for college majors in every other field except ethnic studies" (Atkin, 1981). That qualitative decline was produced by several factors including the opening up to women careers other than the traditionally feminine ones of teaching, nursing, and librarianship, and the drain of qualified secondary school teachers into college teaching positions, especially during the 1960s. The significant decline in the economic rewards from school teaching and probably the lack of intellectual stimulation in schools is increasingly moving away from academic and intellectual matters.

A possible overall explanation as to why secondary schools have begun to fail with respect to their academic mission may be precisely the phenomenon which began to appear in higher education during the 1970s. That was for secondary schools to expand into so many new activities unrelated to their historic one of preparation for college that the academic mission simply was overcome or diluted because of the drain of resources to newer sorts of activities. Hofstadter eloquently described what was happening beginning in the 1950s ". . . to fit the views of the new education, the curriculum of many junior and senior high schools has been enriched with new courses in band, chorus, driver education, human relations, home and family living, homemaking, and consumer education. It has been possible for an American child to reach his majority in some communities without having had an opprtunity to understand that the curricula available in his public high school are not everywhere regarded as an education, and may be wholly unsuited to his own aspirations. A few years ago, President A. Whitney Griswold of Yale reported the case of a type altogether familiar to college admissions officers. An apparently able and otherwise promising youth from a midwestern city applied for admission to Yale but could not be considered because the academic part of his last two years of high school consisted only of two years of English and one of American History; the rest was made up of two years of chorus, two years of speech and one year each of typing, physical education, journalism, marriage and family and personal problems . . . traditional education had been founded upon a primary conviction about the value of the various subject matter disciplines and on the assumption that the child, through some degree of mastery of academic subjects, would enlarge his mind for the general ends of life and establish his preparation for the professions for business or other desirable occupations (it was assumed that vocational education could serve those who could not or would not enter into such competition). Contrary to the allegations of the new educators, traditional education was not altogether unmindful of the child but it assumed, on the whole, that he would find some pleasure in a mental activity which was offered him in an academically disciplined education and that he would gain satisfaction from his sense of accomplishment as he moved from stage to stage. Insofar as the learning process was irksome to him, it assumed that self-discipline came from overcoming irksomeness and it would be at least a net gain . . . politically the older education was conservative, in that it accepted the existing order of society and called upon the child to assert himself within its framework--which was largely that of 19th century individualism. But it was also democratic in that it did not commonly assume, much less rejoice in the idea, that large numbers, from any class of society, were necessarily incapable by native endowment of entering with some degree of hope into the world of academic competition, mastery of subject matter, and discipline of mind and character" (Hofstadter, 1966, pp. 354-355).

What Hofstadter implies is that the secondary school would be much more effective if it would return to a more limited conception of its mission. It can be argued that secondary education might significantly be improved, not by eliminating such things as band, chorus, debate, intramural athetics, and the like, but treating them as what they are, extracurricular amenities to brighten the lives of pupils who wish to participate, but by no means representing the principle academic mission for which academic credit is awarded. Whitehead (who should be more frequently read and pondered), after pointing out a potential danger of excessive secondary school demands on students, points out that "there is such a thing as pushing on, of getting to know the fundamental details and the main exact generalizations, and of acquiring an easy mastery of technique. There is no getting away from the fact that things have been found out, and that to be effective in the modern world you must have a store of definite acquirement of the best practice. To write poetry you must know metre; and to build bridges you must be learned in the strength of materials. Even the Hebrew prophets had learned to write, probably in those days requiring no mean effort. The tutored art of genius is--in the words of the prayer book--a vain thing fondly invented (Whitehead, 1951, p. 45).

Exhortation to secondary education will probably not produce any significant change. However, colleges and universities possess a power which might work. That is the power to set admissions requirements for entry into collegiate programs. Prior to the 1930s, college admissions requirements were probably overly rigorous and frequently somewhat irrelevant, as for example in the late 1920s requiring knowledge of Greek and Latin for entry into some institutions. The Eight Year Study of the Progressive Education Association demonstrated that students allowed greater flexibility in their secondary school programs performed in college about as well as those required to take a completely prescribed pattern of courses. However the virtually complete laissez-faire approach of the 1970s, which allowed high school graduates to present a completely self-selected array of high school credits, went too far and contributed to the overall deterioration of collegiate quality. While individual institutions properly should be allowed some latitude, as a general rule, all institutions might be encouraged to impose some relevant requirements which should include four years of English, with clear guidelines that only certain English courses would be considered as meeting entrance requirements. At least two years of mathematics could legitimately be expected, again with the caveat that some high school mathematics courses would not be acceptable, as for example a high school course focusing on a review of elementary school arithmetic. To these courses might be added the requirement of a full year of American history (not social studies), a year course stressing technological knowledge, and perhpas one one-year course in biological or physical science. Such prescriptions can be assailed by both academic tourists and by those favoring a life adjustment emphasis to secondary education. They are presented as a possibly realistic optimum set of standards.

Upon a reformed secondary educational program which clearly differentiated between the curricular and the extracurricular could be built again a collegiate education also differentiating between the curricular and the extracurricular. In such a program the activities for which academic credit would be granted would be severely limited. Those activities supported with public funds would be severely limited in the expectation that other desirable activities would be supported by those individuals who desired to engage in them. It will, of course, be argued that such a stark definition of public support might very well deny individuals not able to afford participation, opportunities enjoyed by the more affluent. It would be argued in this vein that providing for people who could afford it adult training in conversational French, courses on income tax, courses in recreational sports, and courses on estate planning would be unfair to those who could not afford them, and that therefore, in the name of the democratic idea, such activities should be provided without cost to anyone who wished them regardless of ability to pay. Such a doctrine is contrary to the essential nature of a capitalistic democracy. The democracy insures to everyone life, liberty and pursuit of happiness and the protection of a limited number of inalienable rights. The capitalistic part of the equation insures that some people will be able to live differently than others. Legislation and court decisions have established that some level of education is the right of everyone. However, extending that right without limit is economically, socially, and educationally unsound.

Within the context of those three points of view are a number of suggestions for individual institutions seeking not mere survival but maintaining academic and intellectual quality. The first of these is to urge collegiate institutions in general seriously to consider almost the opposite of the major recommendations of the radical reformers. Their basic ideas have been previously discussed, hence are only summarized here. The principal beliefs are:

1. Make major use of non-educational professionals to provide educational service.
2, In general equate life experience with formal academic preparation.
3. Pay as much or even more importance to non-intellectual traits as to intellectual or cognitive ones.
4. Insist that clients decide what they will study, in place of assuming that professionals will decide patterns.
5. Encourage the asymmetrical and irregular scheduling of learning over the symmmetrical and regular use of time.
6. Emphasize the idiosyncratic, individual, educational needs and satisfactions, instead of those common needs shared by all.
7. Prefer the experimental, innovative and new over the traditional.
8. Stress learner evaluation of achievement over evaluations made external to the learner.
9. Maintain the supremacy of egalitarianism.

Relatedly the most frequently made criticisms of higher education, especially undergraduate education, might be reviewed to determine whether or not there was general and widespread basis in fact for them and whether there was persuasive evidence that some other devices would work as well. Some of these common criticisms have been discussed earlier, hence only seven will be listed with brief comment:

1. The Ph.D. as a research degree, does not prepare people for college teaching. Such criticism has validity only if collegiate education is essentially conceived of as concerned with something other than

knowledge, understanding of knowledge, and ability to apply knowledge. The Ph.D. has evolved over a hundred years as an effective way of gaining knowledge, understanding knowledge, and expanding knowledge.

2. The lecture is the predominant mode of instruction which does not allow development of a range of other student traits and aptitudes. While it is undoubtedly true that lecturing can be, and even possibly is frequently dull, disorganized, and desultory, yet in its ideal form it appears to be essential. Ideally new knowledge appears first in primary research reports, then in summaries of research reports, and finally in textbooks. In the ideal setting, students should be expected to master the knowledge presented in a textbook and the purpose of the professorial lecture is to bring to students' attention materials which have not yet reached the review of research or textbook format. Collaterally, this ideal view of the lecture is about the only valid justification for the few number of contact hours with students fulltime professors are expected to have. It is assumed in those hours not spent in classrooms that professors do keep track of expanding knowledge and organize it in such a way as to facilitate acquisition of it.

4. Dividing the undergraduate curriculum into a major, a minor, and a few graduation requirements encourages students to concentrate and specialize and does not allow time or encouragement for broader sorts of learning. This matter may be viewed in several different ways. It is possible to conceive of students divided roughly into two classes--fanatics and dilettantes. The fanatic gains satisfaction from intense specialization, whereas the dilettante gains satisfaction from sampling many different things. It would be extraordinarily

difficult to praise one approach over the other. A more reasonable approach might be to provide opportunity for students to move in whichever direction they wish without prejudice except in a few professional subjects such as engineering or nursing. There has always been sufficient flexibility for the dilettante to explore widely and for the fanatic to concentrate.

5. Because of the credit hour and letter grade system, educational progress has been reduced to numerical accounting which is incapable of revealing the nuances of various kinds of student educational achievements. It is difficult to understand the vehemence with which numerical accounting is attacked. Individuals who would feel happy with a good numerical report regarding their blood pressure, heart rate, red and white blood cells, cholesterol level, and other indexes of health nonetheless reject a possibility that other numerical indexes can actually tell something about educational health. Of course letter grades are frequently capriciously given and, of course, the accumulation of credit hours for a miscellany of experience might present a distorted view of educational competence. It is not the fact of three semester hours credit of A being shown on students' transcript but it is three semester hours credit of A in something which has relationship to other things which is important.
6. The traditional academic calendar of quarters or semesters and the traditional academic scheduling of classes meeting a specified number of hours per week in a symmetrical pattern produces a lockstep which prevents spontaneity of learning which could come from a more flexible arrangement. Without even arguing that spontaneity is not of value and should be encouraged, it can still be pointed out that routine scheduling and allocating activities to particular times and days is a fairly generally found human phenomena. The

best predictor of what an individual will do the next Sunday is what the individual did the last three or four Sundays. All organizations develop metabolic rates based on their essential functions whether they be hospitals, military organizations, or engineering construction firms. The symmetry and regularity of college classes is probably related to a fact of education that it is incremental and takes place for the most part over time rather than through some moment of intense poignancy.

7. Faculty members are excessively conservative and seen unwilling to experment and innovate, thus leading to rigid and routine education practice. Beyond doubt a case can be made that faculty members are conservative, since most of the subjects they value represent conservation of certain kinds of knowledge. It can also be established that some professors rarely change and repeat each year the lectures and jokes of the previous year. It can also be established that some generals will fight the next war with the lessons from previous ones. A guess is that professors typically will experiment with things they believe to be important. They will examine new textbooks, they will attempt different ways of presenting information, they will from time to time create new courses which rearrange their subjects, and they will experiment with different ways of testing for student achievement. The criticism of unwillingness to experiment may very well be based on professors' unwillingness to pretend to be something they know they are not. It is quite understandable that a professor of French might be reluctant to organize a class as a t -group, to try role-playing situations, to attempt nondirective group therapy, or to use films, television, tape recordings and all decorations to stimulate the flavor of the civilization whose language they profess.

Careful analysis of commonly criticized matters may reveal faculty practice and evidence that a practice has really outlived its usefulness. Thus the availability of textbooks probably facilitated elimination of recitation as a primary mode of instruction. But such analysis may indicate that there are substantial reasons for the practices and that only refinement is likely to be necessary. The general point of view of faculties and administrations is that there should be massive and persuasive evidence against academic majors, graduation requirements, formal classrooms taught by full-time faculty, formal tests and letter grades, a clear distinction between curriculur and the extracurriculur the expectation that there be two hours of study for each hour of class, or that the major instructional elements are lectures, discussions, laboratory work, libraries, and unnecessary field trips, before these are rejected in favor of something new.

Rather than seeking to discard traditional practice, institutions might very well opt for urging greater individual competence with respect to the established arms and techniques of education as a means of qualitative improvement. Rather than questing for some new grand design, it would probably be better for institutions, small or large, to encourage clear lecturing, more careful textbook selection, more reliable grading, more regular office hours for advising, more intensive preparation for class, clearer and more detailed criticism of student writing, and clear bibliographics of materials actually in the library, than to encourage a major new curriculum, or a major new approach to instruction, such as competency-based instruction or individually-based learning. Those heroic measures rarely produce the achievements promised and may very well distort time, energy, and attention from those things which can be changed. Quality in most activities increasingly appears to be improved competence with respect to needed routine, whether the matter be preparation of legal briefs, open heart surgery, or a theatrical performance. Quality in higher education does not appear significantly different.

Institutions might also seriously consider, as a matter of institutional policy, embracing high selectivity with respect to competence of faculty members, decentralization of important substantive educational matters to the place where those matters are actually carried on and a feeling of trust that competent faculty members given responsibility will behave responsibly. Many recent developments of centralization of campus authority, creation of supra-institutional agencies, creation of specialists to deal with faculty developments, the curriculum or evaluation, and even recent increases in presumed prerogatives of accreditation appear based on the doctrine of distrust. A plausible doctrine for collegiate institution practice would be to trust that competent faculty members given responsibility to use that competence will likely achieve reasonable results, but can not be expected to produce miracles, or even heroic changes and achievements. So much of the reforming literature virtually demands miracles and heroic achievements - demands which in the end are likely to appear fruitless.

In the companion volume to this one, which deals with institutional survival through the troublous 80's and 90's, a strong argument was advanced that institutions should, for the most part, remain faithful to their traditions rather than departing in new and uncharted directions. That same advice seems highly appropriate with respect to the matter of quality. Quality does seem related to well understood missions, long experience with specific kinds of routines, well understood by the collective memory of individuals in the institution, and recognition over time as to what the institution can likely do. Institutions might well discover what they have been doing well in the past and simply seek to do so in the future.

As a concluding thought for this book some response should be made to the anticipated criticisms that the entire book reflects a worship of the status quo and does not encourage experiment, innovation and change. To the contrary, nothing has been argued to preclude such activities so long as expectations for gigantic and heroic changes are not encouraged and so long as experiment and innovation does not attempt to ask formal education to do something for which it is simply not prepared. In medicine the great post-World War II developments such as increased group practice, health insurance, bio-medical laboratory tests, body scans, techniques of surgery and genetic analysis and counseling were all refinements of what medical doctors traditionally had done - that is, diagnosis and intervention with respect to sickness and health. Recommended changes in medical practice did not suggest that medical doctors become theologians or social workers, although the work of theologians and social workers conceivably has implications for sickness and health. Similarly, changes in legal practice have not altered the essential traditional activities of interviewing clients, doing diligent legal research, preparing documents or appearing and performing in court. There have been changes in legal practice including greater specialization and for efficient ways of locating relevant legal precidents. Even though legal services have been extended to groups previously not well served, the significant change lay in financing that service and not in the essential nature of the service provided. All too frequently the experimentation, innovation and change suggested for higher education have really called for significant departure from traditional practices as for example, urging professors to concentrate on improving students' interpersonal relationships or asking professors to undertake sophisticated psychologically therapeutic interventions.

A realistic theory of educational change may be illustrated by considering three highly important activities - budget preparation, curricular organization and institutional long-range planning. Each year ideally, major institutional constitutencies should be involved in serious discussion of budget preparation, although given the nature of collegiate budgets no significant budget differences will occur because of that discussion. Most budget elements are so fixed that only marginal changes are made each year. Perhaps every eight to ten years there should be widespread discussion of possible changes in curriculum although the actual changes possible are relatively limited as for example, shifting from a semester system to a quarter system or moving from distribution requirements to more or less prescription. Also, every eight to ten years it would be well for there to be widespread efforts at long-range institutional planning although the specifics of developed plans are determined by the institution's tradition, the talents and competencies of individuals in the institution and almost automatic reactions to changes in the environment. While little change is likely to come from widespread discussion of such matters those discussions are nevertheless valuable because they force people to think about the essentials of what they are doing. That thinking will likely produce marginal changes in emphasis. In addition, it is the widespread discussion of important matters which produces a sense of community within the institution which is such a potent educational force. What is being urged is that faculties, administration and boards of trustees ponder seriously such matters knowing full well that heroic changes not only will not likely take place but that for them to take place would likely be a grevious error.

Perhaps Marcus Arelius best expressed an approach to life which could be well applied to collegiate education. "If you work at that which is before you, following right reason seriously, vigorously, calmly, without allowing anything else to distract you, but keeping your divine heart pure, as if you might be bound to give it back immediately; if you hold to this, expecting nothing, fearing nothing, but satisfied with your present activity according to nature and with heroic truth in every word and sound which you utter, you will be happy. And there is no man who is able to prevent this" (Aurelius, 1961, pg. 121).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, H. The Academic Tribes. New York: Liveright, 1976.

Arrowsmith, W. "The Future of Teaching," A. C. Erick, Campus 1980. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Ashby, E. Adapting Universities to a Technological Society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

Astin, A. W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1977,

Atkin, J. M. Who Will Teach in High School? 1981. Unpublished manuscript.

Aurelius, M. "To Himself," in M. Hadas, Essential Works of Stoicism. New York: Bantam Books, 1961.

Bailey, S. K. "Education and the Free Self," in D. W. Vermilye, Individualize the System. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1976.

Baker, H. S.; Greer, B.; & Hughes, E. Making the Grade. New York: John Wylie & Sons, Inc., 1968.

Barzun, J. "The Wasteland of American Education," The New York Review of Books, XXVIII, No. 17, Nov. 5, 1981, p. 37.

Bendiner, R. "The Non Teachers," Horizon," New York, Sept. 1962, Vol. 5, No. 1.

Berdahl, R. O. Evaluating State-Wide Boards. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Blackburn, Robert; Armstrong, Ellen; Conrad, Clifton; Hittem, James; & McKune, Thomas. Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education. Berkeley: The Carnegie Council on Studies in Higher Education, 1976, p. 34.

Bloom, B. S. A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Cognitive Domain. New York: Longmans Green, 1950.

Bolman, F. "Not in Our Stars," in C. C. Walton & F. deW. Bolman, Disorders in Higher Education. Inglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1979.

Bowen, H.R. The Costs of Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Bowen, H. R. Investment in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977, pp. 432-433.

Boyer, E. L. "Breaking Up the Youth Ghetto," in D. W. Vermilye, Lifelong Learners: A New Clientele for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Quality and Equality*. New York:McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968.

Cartter, A.M. *Ph.D.s and the Academic Labor Market*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1976.

Change Magazine, October 1981, p. 52.

Chickering, A. W. and Associates. *The Modern American College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Cohen, A.H. (ed.). *Humanistic Education and Western Civilization*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Cohen, A.M. "On the Road to a Learning Society," in *The Third Century*. New Rochelle:Change Magazine Press, 1977, p. 57.

Cohen, M.B. & March, J.B. *Leadership and Ambiguity*. New York:McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974.

Cooper, R.M. "Improving College Teaching and Administration," in S. Baskin, *Higher Education:Some Newer Developments*. New York:McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965.

Copperman, P. *The Literacy Hoax*. New York:William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1978, p. 41.

Corbally, J.E. & Holmberg-Wright, K. "Identifying Administration Staff Needs," in P. Jedamus, M. Peterson & Associates. *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Crockford, R. E. "The Question of Accreditation: The New England Case Study," *Change*, April, 1981.

Cross, K. P. "New Forms for New Functions," in Dyckman W. Vermilye, *Lifelong Learners--A New Clientele for Higher Education*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

Cross, K. P. "Problems of Access," in S. B. Gould & K.P. Cross. *Expectations in Traditional Study*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Dearing, B. "Pressures Jeopardizing Qualities of Undergraduate Teaching," in G. K. Smith, *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington,D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1965.

Delworth, U. et al. *Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Dibden, A.J. *The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities*. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, Ill., 1968.

Dressel, P.L. "A Review of Non-traditional Graduate Degrees with Particular Emphasis on the Problems of Accreditation," in K.J. Anderson & others, *Record Reports*, Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.:Council on Post Secondary Accreditation, 1978.

Dressel, P.L. & L.B. Mayhew. *Higher Education as a Field of Study*, 1974.

Dressel, P.L. & L.B. Mayhew. *The Impact of Colleges on Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Dupont, G.D. "The Dean and His Office," in A.J. Dibden, *The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1968.

Eble, K.E. *The Craft of Teaching*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Eble, K. *Professors as Teachers*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Enarson, H.H. "Quality and Accountability:Are We Destroying What We Want to Preserve?" *Change*, October, 1980.

English, W.F. "Efforts to Improve College Teaching," in G.K. Smith, *Current Issues in Higher Education*, Washington:National Education Association, 1955.

Faust, C.H. "Specialization and the Liberal Arts in Higher Education," in G.K. Smith, *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington:National Education Association, 1955.

Feldman, K.A. & T.M. Newcomb. *The Impact on College Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Frodin, R. "The Very Simple But Thorough Going," in *The Ideas and Practice of General Education*. Chicago: The University Press, 1950.

Gaff, G.G. *Toward Faculty Renewal*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Geiger, L.G. *Voluntary Accreditation*. Chicago:The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1970.

Glazer, E.A. "The Promise of Lifelong Learning," in *The Third Century*. New Rochelle:Change Magazine Press, 1977, p. 133.

Goheen, R.C. *The Human Nature of the University*. Princeton:Princeton University Press, 1969.

Gollattscheck, J. & Associates. *College Leadership for Community Renewal*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Gould, S.B. & K.P. Cross. *Exploration in Non-Traditional Study*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Grant, G. *On Competence*. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1979.

Grant, G. & D. Riesman. *The Perpetual Dream*. Chicago:The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Hall, L. and Associates. *New colleges for New Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Harrington, F.H. "Shortcomings of Conventional Departments," in D.E. McHenry & Associates, Academic Departments. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

Hatch, W.R. What Standards Do We Raise? Washington:Government Printing Office, 1964.

Jacob, P. Changing Values in College. Greenwood, New Jersey, 1957.

Jencks, C. & D. Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City:Doubleday, Inc., 1968.

Jencks, C. & D. Riesman. "The Art of Teaching," in C. Anderson & D. Murry, The Professors. Cambridge:Schenkman Publishing Co., 1971.

Katz, J. "Personality and Interpersonal Relations in the College Classroom," in N. Sanford, The American College. New York:John Wylie & Sons.

Katz, J. No Time for Youth. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Keeton, Morris T. & Associates. Experiential Learning. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1976, p. 7, 10, 14.

Keeton, M.T. "Networks and Quality," in D. W. Vermilye, Lifelong Learners: A New Clientele for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

Keeton, M.T. "Beyond the Cloister," in The Third Century. New Rochelle: Change Magazine Press, 1977, pp. 179-180.

Kerr, C. "En Attendant 2000," in The Third Century. New Rochelle:Change Magazine Press, 1977, p.42.

Kirk, R. The Intemperate Professor. Baton Rouge:Louisiana State University Press, 1965.

Ladd, E.C. & Lipset, S.M. The Divided Academy. New York:McGraw Hill Book Company, 1975.

Lee, E.C. & F. M. Bowen. Managing Multi-Campus Systems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Lerner, M. America as a Civilization. New York:Simon & Schuster, 1957.

Levine, A. Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978, pp. 359-361.

Levine, A. When Dreams and Heroes Die. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

March, J.G. How We Talk and How We Act. Urbana:University of Illinois, 1981, p. 17.

Mayhew, L.B. & P. Ford. Reform in Graduate and Professional Education. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

Mayhew, L.B. Arrogance on Campus. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Mayhew, L.B. Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969, pp. 11-12.

Mayhew, L.B. Legacy of the Seventies. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

McKeachie, W.J. Teaching Tips:A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. Lexington, Mass.:Heath, 1969.

McKeachie, W.J. "Research on Teachers at the College and University Level," in H.L. Gage, Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago:Rand, McNally & Co., 1963.

Menges, R.G. "Instructional Methods," in A.W. Chickering and Associates, The Modern American College. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Meyer, P. Awarding College Credit for Non-College Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Medeiros, F.A. The Sterling Years At Stanford: A Study in the Dynamics of Institutional Change. Stanford:Stanford University Press, 1979.

Millett, J.D. Financing Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Moody, R.D. Advocate for Vocational Education in California: The Professional Career of Julian A. McPhee. Stanford:Stanford University Press, 1968.

Morrill, R. Teaching Values in College. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Newman, F. The Second Newman Report:National Policy and Higher Education. Cambridge, The M.I.T. Press, 1973.

Pace, C.R. Measuring Outcomes of College. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Paschal, E. "Organizing for Better Instruction," in A. C. Eurich, Campus 1980, New York:Delacorte Press, 1968.

Perkins, J.A. The University as an Organization. New York:McGraw Hill, 1973.

Rashdal, H. The Universities in the Middle Ages. Vol III. Oxford:Claredon Press, 1936, p. 463.

Reaffirmation of Accreditation. Stanford:Stanford University Press, March 1981.

Research Reports, Vol. 2, September, 1978, pp. 157-159.

Riesman, D. "Small Steps to a Larger Vision," in The Third Century. New Rochelle:Change Magazine Press, 1977.

Riesman, D.; J. Musfield & Z. Gamson. Academic Values and Mass Education. Garden City:Doubleday & Co., 1970.

Rosecrance, F. C. The American College and Its Teachers. New York:The MacMillan Company, 1962.

Ruml, B. & D.H. Morrison. Memo to a College Trustee. New York:McGraw Hill Book Co., 1959.

Russell, J.D. "Major Problems Facing Higher Education," in R.W. McDonald, Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington:National Education Association, 1947.

Sanford, N.; A. Chickering & Associates. The Modern American College. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Schmidt, G.B. The Old Time College President. New York:Columbia University Press, p. 130, 1930.

Schumacher, E.F. "Good Work," in D. W. Vermilye, Relating Work and Education. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

Schuster, G.N. Education and Moral Wisdom. New York:Harper & Bros., 1960.

The Second Newman Report:National Policy and Higher Education. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1973.

Silber, J.R. "The Rest Was History," in The Third Century. New Rochelle: Change Magazine Press, 1977, p. 195.

Sloan Commission. A Program for Renewed Partnership. Cambridge:Ballinger Publishing Co., 1980.

Spur, S. Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1970.

Stauffer, T. M. Quality:Higher Education's Principal Challenge. Washington: American Council on Education, 1981.

The Statesand Higher Education. San Francisco, 1976.

Taylor, H. "Symposium," in Arts in Society. Madison:University of Wisconsisn, Summer 1966.

Taylor, H. "The Teacher at His Best," in R.M. Cooper, The Two Ends of the Log. Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

Three Thousand Futures. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980, p. 13.

Trivett, D.A. Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility. Washington,D.C.: The American Association of Higher Education, 1976.

Trow, M. Teachers and Students. New York:McGraw Hill Book Co., 1975.

Trueblood, E. The Idea of a College. New York:Harper & Bros, Publishers, 1959.

Tucker, A. & R. Mantz. "Involvement of Statewide Governing Boards in Accreditation." Educational Record, 59-4, 1978.

Walton, C.C. "Reflections (or Fantasies?) on the University," in C.C. Walton & F. deW. Bolman, Disorders in Higher Education, Inglewood Cliffs:Prentice Hall Inc., 1979.

Weidner, E.W. "Problem Based Departments," in E.D.E. McHenry & Associates, Academic Departments. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977

Whitehead, M. The Aims of Education. New York:Mentor Books, 1951.

Wilson, R.S. "Toward a National Counseling System," in D.W. Vermilye, Lifelong Learners:A New Clientele for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

Withey, S.B. A Degree and What Else. New York:McGraw Hill Book Co., 1971.